

DICTIONARY
OF
NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

TEACH—TOLLET

DICTIONARY
OF
NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

EDITED BY
SIDNEY LEE

VOL. LVI.
TEACH—TOLLET

LONDON
SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 WATERLOO PLACE
1898

[All rights reserved] •

LIST OF WRITERS

IN THE FIFTY-SIXTH VOLUME.

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. A. . . . THE REV. CANON AINGER. | J. C. C. . . . J. CHURTON COLLINS. |
| G. A. A. . . G. A. AITKEN. | A. M. C-E. . MISS A. M. COOKE. |
| J. G. A. . . J. G. ALGER. | T. C. . . . THOMPSON COOPER, F.S.A. |
| P. J. A. . . P. J. ANDERSON. | W. P. C. . . W. P. COURTNEY. |
| A. J. A. . . SIR ALEXANDER JOHN ARBUTHNOT,
K.C.S.I. | L. C. . . . LIONEL CUST, F.S.A. |
| W. A. . . . WALTER ARMSTRONG. | H. D. . . . HENRY DAVEY. |
| J. B. B. . . THE LATE J. B. BAILEY. | C. D. . . . CAMPBELL DODGSON. |
| M. B. . . . MISS BATESON. | R. D. . . . ROBERT DUNLOP. |
| R. B. . . . THE REV. RONALD BAYNE. | F. E. . . . FRANCIS ESPINASSE. |
| T. B. . . . THOMAS BAYNE. | C. L. F. . . C. LITTON FALKNER. |
| L. B-E. . . . LIONEL BEALE, M.B., F.R.S. | C. H. F. . . C. H. FIRTH. |
| C. R. B. . . C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY. | J. G. F-H. . SIR JOSHUA FITCH. |
| C. B. . . . PROFESSOR CECIL BENDALL. | W. G. D. F. THE REV. W. G. D. FLETCHER. |
| H. E. D. B. THE REV. H. E. D. BLAKISTON. | F. W. G. . . F. W. GAMBLE, M.Sc. |
| G. C. B. . . THE LATE G. C. BOASE. | A. G. . . . THE REV. ALEXANDER GORDON. |
| T. G. B. . . THE REV. PROFESSOR BONNEY,
F.R.S. | R. E. G. . . R. E. GRAVES. |
| G. S. B. . . G. S. BOULGER. | J. C. H. . . J. CUTHBERT HADDEN. |
| T. B. B. . . T. B. BROWNING. | J. A. H. . . J. A. HAMILTON. |
| A. R. B. . . THE REV. A. R. BUCKLAND. | T. H. . . . THE REV. THOMAS HAMILTON,
D.D. |
| R. W. B. . . R. W. BURNIE. | A. H-N. . . ARTHUR HARDEN, M.Sc., Ph.D. |
| E. I. C. . . E. IRVING CARLYLE. | C. A. H. . . C. ALEXANDER HARRIS. |
| W. C-R. . . WILLIAM CARR. | T. F. H. . . T. F. HENDERSON. |
| J. L. C. . . J. L. CAW. | W. A. S. H. PROFESSOR W. A. S. HEWINS. |
| J. W. C-K. J. WILLIS CLARK. | G. J. H. . . G. J. HOLYOAKE. |
| E. C-E. . . . SIR ERNEST CLARKE, F.S.A. | W. H. . . . THE REV. WILLIAM HUNT. |
| | W. H. H. . THE REV. W. H. HUTTON, B.D. |

List of Writers.

R. J. J. . . . THE REV. R. JENKIN JONES.	D'A. P. . . . D'ARCY POWER, F.R.C.S.
C. K. CHARLES KENT.	F. R. FRASER RAE.
C. L. K. . . C. L. KINGSFORD.	W. E. R. . . . W. E. RHODES.
J. K. JOSEPH KNIGHT, F.S.A.	J. M. R. . . . J. M. RIGG.
J. K. L. . . . PROFESSOR J. K. LAUGHTON.	H. J. R. . . . H. J. ROBINSON.
E. L. MISS ELIZABETH LEE.	J. H. R. . . . J. H. ROUND.
S. L. SIDNEY LEE.	H. S. S. . . . H. S. SALT.
R. H. L. . . . R. H. LEGGE.	T. S. THOMAS SECOCOMBE.
E. M. L. . . . COLONEL E. M. LLOYD, R.E.	C. F. S. . . . MISS C. FELL SMITH.
J. E. L. . . . J. E. LLOYD.	L. S. LESLIE STEPHEN.
J. H. L. . . . THE REV. J. H. LUPTON, D.D.	G. S-H. GEORGE STRONACH.
J. R. M. . . . J. R. MACDONALD.	C. W. S. . . . C. W. SUTTON.
W. E. M. . . . W. E. MANNERS.	J. T-T. JAMES TAIT.
E. C. M. . . . E. C. MARCHANT.	H. R. T. . . . H. R. TEDDER, F.S.A.
L. M. M. . . . MISS MIDDLETON.	D. LL. T. . . . D. LLEUFER THOMAS.
N. M. NORMAN MOORE, M.D.	E. M. T-D. . . . MISS TODD.
J. B. M. . . . J. BASS MULLINGER.	T. F. T. . . . PROFESSOR T. F. TOUT.
G. LE G. N. G. LE GRYS NORGATE.	G. J. T. . . . G. J. TURNER.
K. N. MISS KATE NORGATE.	A. R. U. . . . A. R. URQUHART, M.D.
D. J. O'D. . . D. J. O'DONOGHUE.	R. H. V. . . . COLONEL R. H. VETCH, R.E.
F. M. O'D. . . F. M. O'DONOGHUE, F.S.A.	C.B.
T. O. THE REV. THOMAS OLDEN.	W. W. W. . . . SURGEON-CAPTAIN W. W. WEBB
A. F. P. . . . A. F. POLLARD.	H. A. W. . . . H. A. WEBSTER.
S. L-P. STANLEY LANE-POOLE.	S. W. STEPHEN WHEELER.
B. P. MISS BERTHA PORTER.	B. B. W. . . . B. B. WOODWARD.

DICTIONARY

OF

NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

Teach

I

Teach

TEACH or **THATCH**, EDWARD (*d.* 1718), pirate, commonly known as Blackbeard, is said to have been a native of Bristol, to have gone out to the West Indies during the war of the Spanish succession, and to have been then employed as a privateer or buccaneer. When the peace came in 1713 the privateers virtually refused to recognise it, and in large numbers turned pirates. Vast numbers of seamen joined them, and, while keeping up a pretence of warring against the French or Spaniards, plundered all that came in their way with absolute impartiality. Thatch was one of the earliest to play the rôle of pirate. He is first heard of in 1716, and in 1717 was in command of a sloop cruising in company with one Benjamin Hornigold. Among other prizes was a large French Guinea ship, which Thatch took command of and fitted as a ship of war mounting 40 guns, naming her *Queen Anne's Revenge*. On the arrival of Woodes Rogers [*q. v.*] as governor of the Bahamas, Hornigold went in and accepted the king's mercy; but Thatch continued his cruise through the West India Islands, along the Spanish Main, then north along the coast of Carolina and Virginia, making many prizes, and rendering his name terrible. He sent one Richards, whom he had placed in command of a tender, with a party of men up to Charlestown to demand a medicine-chest properly fitted. If it was not given he would put his prisoners to death. While one of the prisoners presented this demand, Richards and his fellows swaggered through the town, spreading such terror that the magistrates did not venture to refuse the medicine-chest. Then the pirates went northwards; but on or about 10 June 1718, attempting to go into a creek in North Carolina known as Topsail Inlet,

the *Queen Anne's Revenge* struck on the bar and became a total wreck. Of three sloops in company, one was also wrecked on the bar. Thatch and his men escaped in the other two. They seem to have then quarrelled; many of the men were put on shore and dispersed; some found their way into Virginia and were hanged; the sloops separated, and Thatch, with some twenty or thirty men, went to Bath-town in North Carolina to surrender to the king's proclamation.

It appears that he found allies in the governor, one Eden, and his secretary, Tobias Knight, who was also collector of the province. He brought in some prizes, which his friends condemned in due form. He met at sea two French ships, one laden, the other in ballast. He put all the Frenchmen into the empty ship, brought in the full one, and made affidavit that he had found her deserted at sea—not a soul on board. The story was accepted. Eden got sixty hogsheads of sugar as his share, Knight got twenty, and the ship, said to be in danger of sinking and so blocking the river, was taken outside and burnt, for fear that she might be recognised. Thatch meanwhile led a dissipated life, spending his money freely on shore, but compelling the planters to supply his wants, and levying heavy toll on the vessels that came up the river or went down. As it was useless to apply to Eden for redress, the sufferers were at last driven to send their complaint to Colonel Alexander Spotsiswood [*q. v.*], lieutenant-governor of Virginia, who referred the matter to Captain George Gordon of the Pearl, and Ellis Brand of the Lyme, two frigates then lying in James River for the protection of the trade against pirates. Gordon and Brand had

already heard of Thatch's proceedings, and had ascertained that their ships could not get at him. Now, in consultation with Spottiswood, it was determined to send two small sloops taken up for the occasion, and manned and armed from the frigates, under the command of Robert Maynard, the first lieutenant of the *Pearl*, while Brand went overland to consult with Eden, whose complicity was not known to Spottiswood and his friends.

On 22 Nov. the sloops came up the creek, and, having approached so near the pirate as to interchange Homeric compliments, received the fire of the pirate's guns, loaded to the muzzle with swan shot and scrap iron. All the officers in Lyme's boat were killed, and many men in both. Maynard closed, boarded, sword in hand, and shot Thatch dead. Several pirates were killed, others jumped overboard, fifteen were taken alive, Thatch's head was cut off, and—easy to be recognised by its abundant black beard—suspended from the end of the bowsprit. The sloops with their prize returned to James River, where thirteen out of the fifteen prisoners were hanged. Brand had meantime made a perquisition on shore, and seized a quantity of sugar, cocoa, and other merchandise said to be Thatch's. In doing this he was much obstructed by Knight, who, together with Eden, afterwards entered an action against him for taking what belonged to them. The pirate sloop and property were sold for over 2,000*l.*, which Gordon and Brand insisted should be divided as prize money among the whole ship's companies, while Maynard claimed that it ought to go entirely to him and those who had taken it. This led to a very angry and unseemly quarrel, which ended in the professional ruin of all the three. Neither Gordon nor Brand seems to have had any further employment, and Maynard, whose capture of the pirate was a very dashing piece of work, was not promoted till 1740.

Thatch—as Teach or Blackbeard—has long been received as the ideal pirate of fiction or romance, and nearly as many legends have been fathered on him as on William Kidd [q. v.], with perhaps a little more reason. It may indeed be taken as certain that he did not bury any large hoard of treasure in some unknown bay, and that he never had it to bury. On the other hand, the story of his blowing out the lights in the course of a drinking bout and firing off his pistols under the table, to the serious damage of the legs of one of his companions, is officially told as a reason for not hanging the latter. Teach seems to have been fierce,

reckless, and brutal, without even the virtue of honesty to his fellows.

In all the official papers, naval or colonial, respecting this pirate, he is called Thatch or Thach; the name Teach which has been commonly adopted, on the authority of Johnson, has no official sanction. It is quite impossible to say that either Thatch or Teach was his proper name.

[The Life in Charles Johnson's *Lives of the Pyrates* (1724) is thoroughly accurate, as far as it can be tested by the official records, which are very full. These are Order in Council, 24 Aug. 1721, with memorial from Robert Maynard; Admiralty Records, Captains' Letters, B. 11, Ellis Brand to Admiralty, 12 July 1718, 6 Feb. and 12 March 1718-19; G. 5, Gordon to Admiralty, 14 Sept. 1721; P. 6, Letters of Vincent Pearse, Captain of the *Phoenix*; Board of Trade, Bahamas 1.] J. K. L.

TEDEMAN, SIR THOMAS (d. 1668?), vice-admiral, was presumably one of a family who had been shipowners at Dover at the close of the sixteenth century (*Defeat of the Spanish Armada*, Navy Records Society, i. 86). His father, also Thomas, was still living at Dover in 1658, and is probably the man described as a jurate of Dover in a commission of 28 Oct. 1653. It is, however, impossible to discriminate between the two, and the jurate of 1653 may have been the future vice-admiral. In either case Teddeman does not seem to have served at sea during the civil war; but in 1660 he commanded the *Tredagh* in the Mediterranean, and in May was cruising in the Straits of Gibraltar and as far east as Algiers; on 31 May he met off Algiers six Spanish ships, which he chased into Gibraltar and under the guns of the forts. In November 1660 he was appointed captain of the *Resolution*; in May 1661 of the *Fairfax*. In 1663 he commanded the *Kent*, in which, in July, he carried the Earl of Carlisle to Archangel on an embassy to Russia. In May 1664 he was moved into the *Revenge*; and in 1665, in the *Royal Katherine*, was rear-admiral of the blue squadron, with the Earl of Sandwich, in the action off Lowestoft. For this service he was knighted on 1 July. Afterwards, still with Sandwich, he was at the attack on Bergen and the subsequent capture of the Dutch East Indiamen [see MONTAGU, EDWARD, EARL OF SANDWICH]. Still in the *Royal Katherine*, he was vice-admiral of the blue squadron in the four days' fight, 1-4 June 1666, and vice-admiral of the white in the St. James's fight, 25 July. He had no command in 1667, and his name does not occur again. His contemporary, Captain Henry Teddeman, also of Dover, was pre-

sumably a brother; and the name was still in the 'Navy List' a hundred years later.

[Charnock's Biogr. Nav. i. 47; State Papers, Dom., Charles II (see Calendars).] J. K. L.

TEELING, BARTHOLOMEW (1774–1798), United Irishman, was the eldest son of Luke Teeling and of Mary, daughter of John Taaffe of Smarmore Castle, Louth. He was born in 1774 at Lisburn, where his father, a descendant of an old Anglo-Norman family long settled in co. Meath, had established himself as a linen merchant. The elder Teeling was a delegate for co. Antrim to the catholic convention of 1793, better known as the 'Back Lane parliament.' Though not a United Irishman, he was actively connected with the leaders of the United Irish Society, and was arrested on suspicion of treason in 1796 and confined in Carrickfergus prison till 1802.

Bartholomew, who was educated in Dublin at the academy of the Rev. W. Dubordieu, a French protestant clergyman, joined the United Irish movement before he was twenty, and was an active member of the club committee. In 1796 he went to France to aid in the efforts of Wolfe Tone and others to induce the French government to undertake an invasion of Ireland. His mission having become known to the Irish government, he deemed it unsafe to return to England, and accepted a commission in the French army in the name of Biron. He served a campaign under Hoche with the army of the Rhine. In the autumn of 1798 he was attached to the expedition organised against Ireland as aide-de-camp and interpreter to General Humbert, and, embarking at La Rochelle, landed with the French army at Killala. During the brief campaign of less than three weeks' duration, which terminated with the surrender of Ballinamuck, Teeling distinguished himself by his personal courage, particularly at the battle of Collooney. Being excluded as a British subject from the benefit of the exchange of prisoners which followed the surrender, though claimed by Humbert as his aide-de-camp, he was removed to Dublin, where he was tried before a court-martial. At the trial the evidence for the prosecution, though conclusive as to Teeling's treason, was highly creditable to his humanity and tolerance, one of the witnesses deposing that when some of the rebels had endeavoured to excuse the outrages they had committed, on the ground that the victims were protestants, 'Mr. Teeling warmly exclaimed that he knew of no difference between a protestant and a catholic, nor should any be allowed' (*Irish*

Monthly Register, October 1798). But, despite an energetic appeal by Humbert, who wrote that 'Teeling, by his bravery and generous conduct in all the towns through which we have passed, has prevented the insurgents from indulging in the most criminal excesses,' he was sentenced to death by the court-martial. The viceroy finding himself unable to comply with the recommendation to mercy by which the sentence was accompanied, Teeling suffered the extreme penalty of the law at Arbour Hill on 24 Sept. 1798.

CHARLES HAMILTON TEELING (1778–1850), Irish journalist, was a younger brother of Bartholomew, and, like him, connected with the United Irish movement. On 16 Sept. 1796, when still a lad, he was arrested with his father by Lord Castlereagh on suspicion of treason. He had previously been offered a commission in the British army, but had declined it as incompatible with his political sentiments. In 1802 he settled at Dundalk as a linen-bleacher. Subsequently he became proprietor of the 'Belfast Northern Herald,' and later on removed to Newry, where he established the 'Newry Examiner.' He was also (1832–5) the proprietor and editor of a monthly periodical, the 'Ulster Magazine.' In 1828 Teeling published his 'Personal Narrative of the Rebellion of 1798,' and in 1832 a 'Sequel' to this work appeared. The 'Narrative,' especially the earlier portion, is of considerable historical value. Though feeble as a literary performance, it throws much light on the state of feeling among the Roman catholics of Ulster prior to the Rebellion, and upon the later stages of the United Irish movement, as well as upon the actual progress of the insurrection in Ulster. In 1835 Teeling published 'The History and Consequences of the Battle of the Diamond,' a pamphlet which gives the Roman catholic version of the events in which the Orange Society originated, and in which the author himself had some share. Teeling died in Dublin in 1850. In 1802 he married Miss Carolan of Carrickmacross, co. Monaghan. His eldest daughter married, in 1836, Thomas (afterwards Lord) O'Hagan [q. v.], lord chancellor of Ireland.

[Personal Narrative of the Irish Rebellion, pp. 14–22, Sequel thereto, pp. 209–32; Madden's United Irishmen, i. 326, iv. 15–27; J. Bowes Daly's Ireland in '98, pp. 375–400; Tone's Autobiography, ed. Barry O'Brien, 1893, ii. 347; Cornwallis Correspondence, ii. 389, 402; Lecky's Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, v. 63; private information.] C. L. F.

TEESDALE, SIR CHRISTOPHER CHARLES (1833–1893), major-general, royal artillery, son of Lieutenant-general

Henry George Teesdale of South Bersted, Sussex, was born at the Cape of Good Hope on 1 June 1833. He entered the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich in May 1848, and received a commission as second lieutenant in the royal artillery on 18 June 1851. He went to Corfu in 1852, was promoted to be first lieutenant on 22 April 1853, and in the following year was appointed aide-de-camp to Colonel (afterwards General Sir) William Fenwick Williams [q.v.], British commissioner with the Turkish army in Asia Minor during the war with Russia.

Teesdale, with Dr. Humphry Sandwith [q.v.], another member of the British commissioner's staff, accompanied Williams to Erzeroum, and thence to Kars, where they arrived on 21 Sept. 1854. Williams returned to the headquarters of the Turkish army at Erzeroum, leaving Teesdale at Kars to establish what discipline and order he could. During the whole winter Teesdale, aided by his interpreter, Mr. Zohrab, worked incessantly to secure the well-being of the troops in Kars. Sandwith says he exhibited such a rare combination of firmness and conciliatory tact that he won all hearts, and the grey-bearded old general, Kherim Pasha, never ventured on any act of importance without first consulting this young subaltern of artillery. Colonel (afterwards Sir) Henry Atwell Lake [q.v.] and Captain Henry Langhorne Thompson [q.v.] having arrived at Kars in March 1855, Teesdale returned to Erzeroum and rejoined his chief, who, in January, had been made a lieutenant-general, or *ferik*, in the Turkish army, and a pasha. At the same time Teesdale had been made a major in the Turkish army. In a letter from the foreign office dated 7 March 1855, her majesty's government approved of Teesdale's efforts in averting from the garrison of Kars the horrors that they suffered from famine in the previous winter. After the thawing of the snow Teesdale was daily engaged with Williams from early morning to sunset in fortifying all the heights around Erzeroum.

On 1 June 1855 a courier from Lake informed Williams of the formidable Russian army assembled at Gumri, and the indication of a speedy advance upon Kars. On the following day Teesdale started with Williams and Sandwith for Kars, arriving there on 7 June. On the 9th Teesdale, with Zohrab his interpreter, went to his post at the Tahmasp batteries, and on the 12th he made a reconnaissance of the Russian camp. On the 16th the Russians, twenty-five thousand strong, attacked early in the morning, but

were repulsed by the artillery fire of the fortress. Williams, in his despatch, records his thanks to Teesdale, 'whose labours were incessant.' Two days later the Russians established a blockade of Kars, and shortly afterwards intercepted communication with Erzeroum. The garrison of Kars was continually occupied in skirmishes with the enemy, and in the task of strengthening the fortifications. On 7 Aug. an attack was made by the Russians, who were again beaten off.

Teesdale lived in Tahmasp Tabia with that gallant Hungarian and first-rate soldier, General Kmety, for whom he had a great admiration. He acted as chief of his staff, and, besides his graver duties, was constantly engaged in harassing the Cossacks with parties of riflemen, or in menacing and attacking the Russian cavalry with a company of rifles and a couple of guns.

Early in September the weather grew suddenly cold, and snow fell. Provisions were scarce, and desertions became frequent. Late in the month cholera appeared. At 4 A.M. on 29 Sept. the Russian general Mouravieff, with the bulk of his army, attacked the heights above Kars and on the opposite side of the river. At Tahmasp the advance was distinctly heard and preparations made to meet it. The guns were quietly charged with grape. Teesdale, returning from his rounds, flung himself into the most exposed battery in the redoubt Yuksek Tabia, the key of the position. The Russians advanced with their usual steadiness in three close columns, supported by twenty-four guns, and hoped under cover of the mist and in the dim light of dawn to effect a surprise; but they were received with a crushing artillery fire of grape. Undaunted, the Russian infantry cheered and rushed up the hill to the breastworks and, in spite of a murderous fire of musketry, drove out the Turks and advanced to the rear of the redoubts of Tahmasp and Yuksek Tabia, where desperate fighting took place. Teesdale turned some of his guns to the rear and worked them vigorously. The redoubts being closed in rear and flanking one another, the artillery and musketry fire from them made havoc in the ranks of the assailants. Nevertheless the Russians precipitated themselves upon the works, at some even effected an entrance. They were killed 'on the platform of a gun which at that moment was being worked' by Teesdale, who then sprang out and led to charges with the bayonet, the Turks fighting like heroes' (Letter from General Williams, 30 Sept. 1855).

During the hottest part of the action, when the enemy's fire had driven the Turkish artillerymen from their guns, Teesdale rallied his gunners, and by his intrepid example induced them to return to their posts. After having led the final charge which completed the victory of the day, Teesdale, at great personal risk, saved from the fury of his Turks a considerable number of the disabled among the enemy, who were lying wounded outside the works. This was witnessed and gratefully acknowledged before the Russian staff by General Mouravieff (*London Gazette*, 25 Sept. 1857). The battle of Kars lasted seven and a half hours. Near midday, however, the Russians were driven off in great disorder, and fled down the heights under a heavy musketry fire. Their loss was over six thousand killed and about as many wounded.

Teesdale, who was hit by a piece of spent shell and received a severe contusion, was most favourably mentioned in despatches. On 12 Oct. General Williams wrote: 'My aide-de-camp, Teesdale, had charge of the central redoubt and fought like a lion.' After the battle the mushir, on behalf of the sultan, decorated Teesdale with the third class of the order of the Medjidie, and promoted him to be a lieutenant-colonel in the Turkish army (Despatch from General Williams to Lord Clarendon, 31 Oct. 1855).

Cholera and famine assumed serious proportions in October, and, although the former ceased in November, severe cold added to the sufferings of the garrison, and every night a number of desertions took place. On 22 Oct. news had arrived of a relieving army of twenty thousand men under Selim Pasha, and in the middle of November it was daily expected from Erzeroum, where it had arrived at the beginning of the month. But Selim had no intention of advancing. On 24 Nov. it was considered impossible to hold out any longer, and, there being no hope of relief, Teesdale was sent with a flag of truce to the Russian camp to arrange for a meeting of the generals and to discuss terms of capitulation; these were arranged the following day, and on the 28th the garrison laid down its arms, and Teesdale and the other English officers became prisoners of war.

The English officers were most hospitably treated by the Russians, and started on 30 Nov. for Tiflis, which they reached on 8 Dec. In January 1856 Teesdale accompanied General Williams to Kiazan, about 180 miles from Moscow. After having been presented to the czar in March, they were

given their liberty and proceeded to England.

Teesdale was made a C.B. on 21 June 1856, though still a lieutenant of royal artillery. He was also made an officer of the Legion of Honour, received the medal for Kars, and on 25 Sept. 1857 was awarded the Victoria Cross for acts of bravery at the battle of 29 Sept. 1855.

From 1856 to 1859 Teesdale continued to serve as aide-de-camp to Fenwick-Williams, who had been appointed commandant of the Woolwich district. On 1 Jan. 1858 he was promoted to be second captain in the royal artillery, and on the 15th of the same month to be brevet major in the army for distinguished service in the field. On 9 Nov. 1858 he was appointed equerry to the Prince of Wales, a position which he held for thirty-two years. From 1859 to 1864 he was again aide-de-camp to Fenwick-Williams during his term of office as inspector-general of artillery at headquarters in London. Teesdale was promoted to be first captain in the royal artillery on 3 Feb. 1866, brevet lieutenant-colonel on 14 Dec. 1868, major royal artillery on 5 July 1872, and lieutenant-colonel in his regiment on 23 Sept. 1875. He was appointed aide-de-camp to the queen and promoted to be colonel in the army on 1 Oct. 1877, regimental colonel on 1 Oct. 1882, and major-general on 22 April 1887. On 8 July 1887, on the occasion of the queen's jubilee, he was made a knight commander of St. Michael and St. George.

In 1890 Teesdale resigned the appointment of equerry to the Prince of Wales, and was appointed master of the ceremonies and extra equerry to the prince, positions which he held until his death. He retired from the army active list with a pension on 22 April 1892. He died, unmarried, on 1 Nov. 1893 at his residence, The Ark, South Bersted, Sussex, from a paralytic stroke, a few days after his return from a small estate he had in Germany. He was buried on 4 Nov. in South Bersted churchyard. He wrote a slight sketch of the services of Sir W. F. Williams for the 'Proceedings' of the Royal Artillery Institution (vol. xii. pt. ix.)

[War Office Records; Despatches; Royal Artillery Records; Times (London), 2 and 6 Nov. 1893; United Service Mag. 1855 and 1857; Gent. Mag. 1856 and 1858; Lake's Kars and our Captivity in Russia, 1856; Sandwith's Narrative of the Siege of Kars, 1856; A Campaign with the Turks in Asia, by Charles Duncan, 2 vols. 1856.]

R. H. V.

TEGAI (1805-1864), Welsh poet. [See HUGHES, HUGH.]

TEGG, THOMAS (1776–1845), bookseller, the son of a grocer, was born at Wimbledon, Surrey, on 4 March 1776. Being left an orphan at the age of five, he was sent to Galashiel in Selkirkshire, where he was boarded, lodged, clothed, and educated for ten guineas a year. In 1785 he was bound apprentice to Alexander Meggett, a bookseller at Dalkeith. His master treating him very badly, he ran away, and for a month gained a living at Berwick by selling chap-books about fortune-telling, conjuring, and dreams. At Newcastle he stayed some weeks, and formed an acquaintance with Thomas Bewick, the wood engraver. Proceeding to Sheffield, he obtained employment from Gale, the proprietor of the 'Sheffield Register,' at seven shillings a week, and during a residence of nine months saw Tom Paine and Charles Dibdin. His further wanderings led him to Ireland and Wales, and then, after some years at Lynn in Norfolk, he came to London in 1796, and obtained an engagement with William Lane, the proprietor of the Minerva Library at 53 Leadenhall Street. He subsequently served with John and Arthur Arch, the quaker booksellers of Gracechurch Street, where he stayed until he began business on his own account.

Having received 200*l.* from the wreck of his father's property, he took a shop in partnership with a Mr. Dewick in Aldersgate Street, and became a bookmaker as well as a bookseller, his first small book, 'The Complete Confectioner,' reaching a second edition. On 20 April 1800 he married, and opened a shop in St. John Street, Clerkenwell, but, losing money through the treachery of a friend, he took out a country auction license to try his fortune in the provinces. He started with a stock of shilling political pamphlets and some thousands of the 'Monthly Visitor.' At Worcester he obtained a parcel of books from a clergyman, and held his first auction, which produced 30*l.* With his wife acting as clerk, he travelled through the country, buying up duplicates in private libraries, and rapidly paying off his debts. Returning to London in 1805, he opened a shop at 111 Cheapside, and began printing a series of pamphlets which were abridgments of popular works. His success was great. Of such books he at one time had two hundred kinds, many of which sold to the extent of four thousand copies. Up to the close of 1840 he published four thousand works on his own account, of which not more than twenty were failures. Of 'The Whole Life of Nelson,' which he brought out immediately after the receipt of the news of the battle of

Trafalgar in 1805, he sold fifty thousand sixpenny copies, and of 'The Life of Mrs. Mary Ann Clarke,' 1810, thirteen thousand copies at 7*s.* 6*d.* each.

In 1824 he purchased the copyright of Hone's 'Everyday Book and Table Book,' and, republishing the whole in weekly parts, cleared a very large profit. He then gave Hone 500*l.* to write 'The Year Book,' which proved much less successful.

As soon as his own publications commenced paying well he gave up the auctions, which he had continued nightly at 111 Cheapside. In 1824 he made his final move to 73 Cheapside. In 1825 he commenced 'The London Encyclopedia of Science, Art, Literature, and Practical Mechanics,' which ran to twenty-two volumes. But his reputation as a bookseller chiefly rested upon his cheap reprints, abridgments of popular works, and his distribution of remainders, which he purchased on a very large scale. He is mentioned as a populariser of literature in Thomas Carlyle's famous petition on the copyright bill in April 1839.

In 1835, being then a common councilman of the ward of Cheap, he was nominated an alderman, but was not elected. In 1836 he was chosen sheriff, and paid the fine to escape serving. To the usual fine of 400*l.* he added another 100*l.*, and the whole went to found a Tegg scholarship at the City of London school, and he increased the gift by a valuable collection of books.

He died on 21 April 1845, and was buried at Wimbledon. He was generally believed to have been the original of Timothy Twigg in Thomas Hood's novel, 'Tylney Hall,' 3 vols. 1834. Tegg left three sons, of whom Thomas Tegg, a bookseller, died on 15 Sept. 1871 (*Bookseller*, 30 June 1864 p. 372, 3 Oct. 1871 p. 811); and William is separately noticed.

Tegg was author of: 1. 'Memoirs of Sir F. Burdett,' 1804. 2. 'Tegg's Prime Song Book, bang up to the mark,' 1810; third collection, 1810; fourth collection, 1810. 3. 'The Rise, Progress, and Termination of the O. P. War at Covent Garden, in Poetic Epistles,' 1810. 4. 'Chronology, or the Historical Companion: a register of events from the earliest period to the present time,' 1811; 5th edit. 1854. 5. 'Book of Utility or Repository of useful Information, connected with the Moral, Intellectual, and Physical Condition of Man,' 1822. 6. 'Remarks on the Speech of Serjeant Talfourd on the Laws relating to Copyright,' 1837. 7. 'Handbook for Emigrants, containing Information on Domestic, Mechanical, Medical, and other subjects,' 1839. 8. 'Extension of Copyright pro-

posed by Serjeant Talfourd,' 1840. 9. 'Treasury of Wit and Anecdote,' 1842. 10. 'A Present to an Apprentice,' 2nd edit. 1848. He also edited 'The Magazine of Knowledge and Amusement,' 1843-4; twelve numbers only. *

[Curwen's Booksellers, 1873, pp. 379-98; Bookseller, 1 Sept. 1870, p. 756.] G. C. B.

TEGG, WILLIAM (1816-1895), son of Thomas Tegg [q. v.], was born in Cheapside, London, in 1816. After being articled to an engraver, he was taken into his father's publishing and bookselling business, to which he succeeded on his father's death in 1845. He was well known as a publisher of school-books, and he also formed a considerable export connection. One branch of his business consisted of the reprinting of standard works at very moderate prices. In his later years he removed to 85 Queen Street, Cheap-side.

He knew intimately George Cruikshank and Charles Dickens in their early days, while Kean, Kemble, and Dion Boucicault were his fast friends. He was a well-known and energetic member of the common council of the city of London. He retired from business some time before his death, which took place at 13 Doughty Street, London, on 23 Dec. 1895.

His name is attached to upwards of forty works, many of them compilations. The following are the best known: 1. 'The Cruet Stand: a Collection of Anecdotes,' 1871. 2. 'Epitaphs . . . and a Selection of Epigrams,' 1875. 3. 'Proverbs from Far and Near, Wise Sentences . . .,' 1875. 4. 'Lacomics, or good Words of the Best Authors,' 1875. 5. 'The Mixture for Low Spirits, being a Compound of Witty Sayings,' 4th ed. 1876. 6. 'Trials of W. Hone for publishing Three Parodies,' 1876. 7. 'Wills of their own, Curious, Eccentric, and Benevolent,' 1876, 4th ed. 1879. 8. 'The Last Act, being the Funeral Rites of Nations and Individuals,' 1876. 9. 'Meetings and Greetings: Salutations of Nations,' 1877. 10. 'The Knot tied, Marriage Ceremonies of all Nations,' 1877. 11. 'Posts and Telegraphs, Past and Present, with an Account of the Telephone and Phonograph,' 1878. 12. 'Shakespeare and his Contemporaries, together with the Plots of his Plays, Theatres, and Actors,' 1879. Under the name of Peter Parley he brought out much popular juvenile literature, which was either reprinted from or founded on books written by the American writer, Samuel Griswold Goodrich (ALLIBONE, *Dict. of English Literature*, 1859, i. 703).

[Times, 27 Dec. 1895, p. 7; Athenæum, 1895, ii. 903; Bookseller, 30 June 1864, 10 Jan. 1896.] G. C. B.

TEGID (1792-1852), Welsh poet and antiquary. [See JONES, JOHN.]

TEIGNMOUTH, BARON. [See SHORE, JOHN, first baron, 1751-1834.]

TEILO (*A.* 550), British saint, was born at 'Eccluis Gunniau (or Guiniau)' in the neighbourhood of Tenby (*Lib. Land.* pp. 124, 255). The statement of the life in the 'Liber Landavensis' that he was of noble parentage is supported by the genealogies, which make him the son of a man variously called Enoc, Eusych, Cussith, and Eisyllt, and great-grandson of Ceredig ap Cunedda Wledig (*Myryrian Archaeology*, 2nd edit. pp. 415, 430; *Iolo MSS.* p. 124). In the life of Oudocens in the 'Liber Landavensis' the form is Ensic (p. 130). Mr. Phillimore believes (*Cymmrodor*, xi. 125) the name should be Usyllt, the patron saint of St. Issell's, near Tenby. Teilo's first preceptor was, according to his legend, Dyfrig (cf. the Life of Dyfrig in *Lib. Land.* p. 80). He next entered the monastic school of Paulinus, where David (*d.* 601?) [q. v.], his kinsman, was his fellow-pupil. In substantial agreement with the accounts given in the legends of David and Padarn, it is said that the three saints received a divine command to visit Jerusalem, where they were made bishops—a story clearly meant to bring out British independence of Rome. Teilo especially distinguished himself on this journey by his saintly humility and power as a preacher. He received as a gift a bell of miraculous virtue, and returned to take charge of the diocese of Llandaff in succession to Dyfrig. Almost immediately, however, the yellow plague (which is known to have caused the death of Maelgwn Gwynedd about 547) began to rage in Britain, whereupon Teilo, at the bidding of an angel, withdrew to Brittany, spending some time on the way as the guest of King Geraint of Cornwall. When the plague was over it was his wish to return to this country, but, at the instance of King Budic and Bishop Samson [q. v.], he remained in Brittany for seven years and seven months. Returning at last to his bishopric, he became chief over all the churches of 'dextralis Britannia,' sending Ismael to fill the place of David at Menevia, and other disciples of his to new dioceses which he created. As his end drew near, three churches, viz. Penally, Llandaff, and Llandeilo Fawr (where he died), contended for the honour of receiving his corpse, but the dispute was settled by the creation of three bodies, a

miracle which is the subject of one of the triads (*Myr. Arch.* 1st ser. p. 41).

This is the Llandaff account of Teilo, meant to bring out his position as second bishop of the see. In Rhygyfarch's 'Life of St. David,' written before 1099, Teilo appears, on the other hand, as a disciple of that saint (*Cambro-British Saints*, pp. 124, 135); and, according to Giraldus Cambrensis (*Itinerary*, ii. 1, MS. d. vi. 102, of Rolls edit.), he was his immediate successor as bishop of St. David's. There is, however, no reason to suppose he was a diocesan bishop at all. Like others of his age, he founded monasteries (many of them bearing his name), and Llandaff was perhaps the 'archimonasterium' (for the term see *Lib. Land.* pp. 74, 75, 129) or parent house (*Cymmrodor*, xi. 115-16). Dedications to St. Teilo are to be found throughout South Wales; Rees (*Welsh Saints*, pp. 245-6) gives a list of eighteen, and a number of other 'Teilo' churches, which have disappeared or cannot be identified, are mentioned in the 'Liber Landavensis.' That David and Teilo worked together appears likely from the fact that of the eighteen Welsh dedications to Teilo all but three are within the region of David's activity, and outside that district between the Usk and the Tawy in which there are practically no 'Dewi' churches.

There are no recognised dedications to Teilo in Cornwall or Devon, though Borlase seeks (*Age of the Saints*, p. 134) to connect him with Endellion, St. Issey, Phillleigh, and other places. The two forms of the saint's name, Eliud and Teilo (old Welsh 'Teliau'), are both old (see the marginalia of the 'Book of St. Chad,' as printed in the 1893 edition of the *Lib. Land.*) Professor Rhys believes the latter to be a compound of the prefix 'to' and the proper name Eliau or Eiliau (*Arch. Camb.* 5th ser. xii. 37-8). Teilo's festival was 9 Feb.

[Teilo is the subject of a life which appears in the *Liber Lundavensis* (ed. 1893, pp. 97-117), in the portion written about 1150, and also in the Cottonian MS. Vesp. A. xiv. art. 4, which is of about 1200. In the latter manuscript the life is ascribed to 'Geoffrey, brother of bishop Urban of Llandaff,' whom Mr. Gwenogvryn Evans seeks (pref. to *Lib. Land.* p. xxi) to identify with Geoffrey of Monmouth. An abridged version, found, according to Hardy (*Descriptive Catalogue*, i. 132), in Cottonian MS. Tib. E. i. fol. 16, was ascribed to John of Tinmouth [q. v.], was used by Capgrave (*Nova Legenda Angliæ*, p. 280 b), and taken from him by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. 9, ii. 308); other authorities cited.] J. E. L.

TELFAIR, CHARLES (1777?-1833), naturalist, was born at Belfast about 1777, and settled in Mauritius, where he practised as a surgeon. He became a correspondent of Sir William Jackson Hooker [q. v.], sending plants to Kew, and established the botanical gardens at Mauritius and Réunion. He also collected bones of the solitaire from Rodriguez, which he forwarded to the Zoological Society and to the Andersonian Museum, Glasgow. In 1830 he published 'Some Account of the State of Slavery at Mauritius since the British Occupation in 1810, in Refutation of Anonymous Charges . . . against Government and that Colony,' Port Louis, 4to. He died at Port Louis on 14 July 1833, and was buried in the cemetery there. There is an oil portrait of Telfair at the Masonic Lodge, Port Louis, and Hooker commemorated him by the African genus *Telfairia* in the cucumber family. His wife, who died in 1832, also communicated drawings and specimens of Mauritius algæ to Hooker and Harvey.

[*Journal of Botany*, 1834, p. 150; Strickland and Melville's *Dodo and its Kindred*, 1848, p. 52; Britten and Boulger's *Biographical Index of Botanists.*] G. S. B.

TELFER, JAMES (1800-1862), minor poet, son of a shepherd, was born in the parish of Southdean, Roxburghshire, on 3 Dec. 1800. Beginning life as a shepherd, he gradually educated himself for the post of a country schoolmaster. He taught first at Castleton, Langholm, Dumfriesshire, and then for twenty-five years conducted a small adventure school at Saughtrees, Liddisdale, Roxburghshire. On a very limited income he supported a wife and family, and found leisure for literary work. From youth he had been an admirer and imitator of James Hogg (1770-1835) [q. v.], the Ettrick Shepherd, who befriended him. As a writer of the archaic and quaint ballad style illustrated in Hogg's 'Queen's Wake,' Telfer eventually attained a measure of ease and even elegance in composition, and in 1824 he published a volume entitled 'Border Ballads and Miscellaneous Poems.' The ballad, 'The Gloamye Buchte,' descriptive of the potent influence of fairy song, is a skilful development of a happy conception. Telfer contributed to Wilson's 'Tales of the Borders,' 1834, and in 1835 he published 'Barbara Gray,' an interesting prose tale. A selected volume of his prose and verse appeared in 1852. He died on 18 Jan. 1862.

[*Rogers's Modern Scottish Minstrel*; Grant Wilson's *Poets and Poetry of Scotland.*] T. B.

TELFORD, THOMAS (1757-1834), engineer, was born on 9 Aug. 1757 at Westerkirk, a secluded hamlet of Eskdale, in Eastern Dumfriesshire. He lost his father, a shepherd, a few months after his birth, and was left to the care of his mother, who earned a scanty living by occasional farm work. When he was old enough he herded cattle and made himself generally useful to the neighbouring farmers, and grew up so cheerful a boy that he was known as 'Laughing Tam.' At intervals he attended the parish school of Westerkirk, where he learned nothing more than the three R's. He was about fifteen when he was apprenticed to a mason at Langholm, where a new Duke of Buccleuch was improving the houses and holdings of his tenantry, and Telford found much and varied work for his hands to do. His industry, intelligence, and love of reading attracted the notice of a Langholm lady, who made him free of her little library, and thus was fostered a love of literature which continued with him to the end of his busy life. 'Paradise Lost' and Burns's 'Poems' were among his favourite books, and from reading verse he took to writing it. His apprenticeship was over, and he was working as a journeyman mason at eighteenpence a day, when at two-and-twenty he found his rhymes admitted into Ruddiman's 'Edinburgh Magazine' (see MAYNE, *Siller Gun*, ed. 1836, p. 227). A poetical address to Burns entreating him to write more verse in the spirit of the 'Cotter's Saturday Night' was found among Burns's papers after his death, and a portion of it was published in the first edition of Currie's 'Burns' (1800, App. ii. note D). The most ambitious of Telford's early metrical performances was 'Eskdale,' a poem descriptive of his native district, which was first published in the 'Poetical Museum' (Hawick, 1784), and was reprinted by Telford himself with a few additions, and for private circulation, some forty years afterwards. Southey said of it, 'Many poems which evinced less observation, less feeling, and were in all respects of less promise, have obtained university prizes.'

Having learned in the way of his trade all that was to be learned in Eskdale, Telford removed in 1780 to Edinburgh, where the new town was in course of being built, and, skilled masons being in demand, he easily found suitable employment. He availed himself of the opportunities which his stay afforded him for studying and sketching specimens of the older architecture of Scotland. After spending two years in Edinburgh he resolved on trying his fortune in London,

whither he proceeded at the age of twenty-five. His first employment was as a brewer at Somerset House, then in course of erection by Sir William Chambers. Two years later, in 1784, Telford received a commission (it is not known how procured) to superintend the erection, among other buildings, of a house for the occupation of the commissioner of Portsmouth dockyard. Here he had opportunities, which he did not neglect, for watching dockyard operations of various kinds, by a knowledge of which he profited in after life. His work in his own department gave great satisfaction. He amused his leisure by writing verses, and he improved it by studying chemistry. By the end of 1786 his task was completed, and now a new and wider career was opened to him.

One of Telford's Dumfriesshire acquaintances and patrons was a Mr. Johnstone of Westerhall, who assumed the name of Pulteney on marrying a great heiress, the niece of William Pulteney, earl of Bath [q.v.]. Before Telford left London for Portsmouth Mr. (afterwards Sir William) Pulteney had consulted him respecting some repairs to be executed in the family mansion at Westerhall, and took a great liking to his young countryman. Pulteney became through his wife a large landowner in the neighbourhood of Shrewsbury, which he long represented in parliament. When Telford's employment at Portsmouth came to an end, Pulteney thought of fitting up the castle at Shrewsbury as a residence, and invited Telford to Shrewsbury to superintend the required alterations. Telford accepted the invitation, and while he was working at the alterations the office of surveyor of public works for Shropshire became vacant. The appointment was bestowed on Telford, doubtless through the influence of Pulteney. Of Telford's multifarious, important, and trying duties in this responsible and conspicuous position, it must suffice to say that he discharged them most successfully and made himself personally popular, so much so that in 1793, without solicitation on his part, he was appointed by the Shropshire county magnates sole agent, engineer, and architect of the Ellesmere canal, projected to connect the Mersey, the Dee, and the Severn. It was the greatest work of the kind then in course of being undertaken in the United Kingdom. On accepting the appointment Telford resigned the county surveyorship of Shropshire. His salary as engineer of the Ellesmere canal was only 500*l.* a year, and out of this he had to pay a clerk, a foreman, and his own travelling expenses.

The labours of Telford as engineer of the

Ellesmere canal include two achievements which were on a scale then unparalleled in England and marked by great originality. The aqueducts over the valley of the Ceiriog at Chirk and over the Dee at Pont-Cysylltau have been pronounced by the chief English historian of inland navigation to be 'among the boldest efforts of human invention in modern times.' The originality of the conception carried out lay in both cases not so much in the magnitude of the aqueducts, unprecedented as this was, as in the construction of the bed in which the canal was carried over river and valley. A similar feat had been performed by Brindley, but he transported the water of the canal in a bed of puddled earth; and necessarily of a breadth which required the support of piers, abutments, and arches of the most massive masonry. In spite of this the frosts, by expanding the moist puddle, frequently produced fissures which burst the masonry, suffering the water to escape, and sometimes causing the overthrow of the aqueducts. For the bed of puddled earth Telford substituted a trough of cast-iron plates infixed in square stone masonry. Not only was the displacement produced by frosts averted, but there was a great saving in the size and strength of the masonry, an enormous amount of which would have been required to support a puddled channel at the height of the Chirk and Pont-Cysylltau aqueducts. The Chirk aqueduct consisted of ten arches of forty span each, carrying the canal 70 ft. above the level of the river over a valley 700 ft. wide, and forming a most picturesque object in a beautiful landscape. On a still larger scale was the Pont-Cysylltau aqueduct over the Dee four miles north of Chirk and in the vale of Llangollen; 121 ft. over the level of the river at low water the canal was carried in its cast-iron trough, with a water-way 11 ft. 10 in. wide, and nineteen arches extending to the length of 1,007 ft. The first stone of the Chirk aqueduct was laid on 17 June 1796, and it was completed in 1801. The first stone of the other great aqueduct was laid on 25 June 1795, and it was opened for traffic in 1805. Of this Pont-Cysylltau aqueduct Sir Walter Scott said to Southey that 'it was the most impressive work of art which he had ever seen' (SMILES, p. 159).

In 1800 Telford was in London giving evidence before a select committee of the House of Commons which was considering projects for the improvement of the port of London. One of these was the removal of the old London Bridge and the erection of a new one. While surveyor of public works for Shropshire Telford had had much

experience in bridge-building. Of several iron bridges which he built in that county, the earliest, in 1795-8, was a very fine one over the Severn at Buildwas, about midway between Shrewsbury and Bridgnorth; it consisted of a single arch of 130 feet span. He now proposed to erect a new London Bridge of iron and of a single arch. The scheme was ridiculed by many, but, after listening to the evidence of experts, a parliamentary committee approved of it, and the preliminary works were, it seems, actually begun. The execution of the bold project was not proceeded with, on account, it is said, of difficulties connected with making the necessary approaches (*ib.* p. 181). But Telford's plan of the new bridge was published in 1801, and procured him favourable notice in high quarters, from the king and the Prince of Wales downwards.

Telford's skill and energies were now to be utilised for an object very dear to him, the improvement of his native country. At the beginning of the century, at the instance of his old friend Sir William Pulteney, who was governor of the British Fisheries Society, he inspected the harbours at their various stations on the northern and eastern coasts of Scotland, and drew up an instructive and suggestive report. Telford's name was now well known in London, but doubtless this report contributed to procure him in 1801 a commission from the government to undertake a far wider Scottish survey. This step was taken from considerations partly connected with national defence. There was no naval station anywhere on the Scottish coasts, and an old project was being revived to make the great glen of Scotland, which cuts it diagonally from the North Sea to the Atlantic, available as a water-way for ships of war as well as for traffic. The results of Telford's investigations were printed in an exhaustive report presented to parliament in 1803. Two bodies of commissioners were appointed to superintend and make provision for carrying out his recommendations, which included the construction of the Caledonian canal in the central glen already mentioned, and, what was still more urgently needed, extensive road-making and bridge-building in the highlands and northern counties of Scotland. Telford was appointed engineer of the Caledonian canal, the whole cost of which was to be defrayed by parliamentary grants. The expenditure on the road-making and bridge-building, to be planned by him, was to be met only partly by parliamentary grants, government supplying one half of the money required wherever the landowners were ready to contribute the other

half. The landowners as a body cheerfully accepted this arrangement, while Telford threw himself body and soul into both enterprises with a patriotic even greater than his customary professional zeal.

The chief roads in the highlands and northern counties of Scotland had been made after the rebellions of 1715 and 1745 purely for military purposes, and were quite inadequate as means of general communication. The usefulness, such as it was, of these military roads was moreover marred by the absence of bridges: for instance, over the Tay at Dunkeld and the Spey at Fochabers, these and other principal rivers having to be crossed by ferry-boats, always inconvenient and often dangerous. In mountainous districts the people were scattered in isolated clusters of miserable huts, without possibility of intercommunication, and with no industry so profitable as the illicit distillation of whisky. 'The interior of the county of Sutherland being inaccessible, the only track lay along the shore among rocks and sands, which were covered by the sea at every tide.' In eighteen years, thanks to the indefatigable energy of Telford, to the prudent liberality of the government, and to the public spirit of the landowners, the face of the Scottish highlands and northern counties was completely changed. Nine hundred and twenty miles of good roads and 120 bridges were added to their means of communication. In his survey of the results of these operations and of his labours on the Caledonian canal Telford speaks not merely as an engineer, but as a social economist and reformer. Three thousand two hundred men had been annually employed, and taught for the first time the use of tools. 'These undertakings,' he said, 'may be regarded in the light of a working academy, from which eight hundred men have annually gone forth improved workmen.' The plough of civilisation had been substituted for the former crooked stick, with a piece of iron affixed to it, to be drawn or pushed along, and wheeled vehicles carried the loads formerly borne on the backs of women. The spectacle of habits of industry and its rewards had raised the moral standard of the population. According to Telford, 'about 200,000*l.* had been granted in fifteen years,' and the country had been advanced 'at least a century.'

The execution of Telford's plans for the improvement of Scottish harbours and fishing stations followed on the successful inception of his road-making and bridge-building. Of the more important of his harbour works, that at the great fishery station Wick, begun in 1808, was the earliest, while about

the latest which he designed was that at Dundee in 1814. Aberdeen, Peterhead, Banff, Leith, the port of Edinburgh, are only a few of his works of harbour extension and construction which did so much for the commerce and fisheries of Scotland, and in some cases his labours were facilitated by previous reports on Scottish harbours made by Rennie [see *RENNIE, JOHN*, 1783-1821], whose recommendations had not been carried out from a lack of funds. In this respect Telford was more fortunate, considerable advances from the fund accumulated by the commissioners of forfeited estates in Scotland being made to aid local contributions on harbour works.

Of Telford's engineering enterprises in Scotland the most conspicuous, but far from the most useful, was the Caledonian canal. Though nature had furnished for it most of the water-way, the twenty or so miles of land which connected the various fresh-water lochs forming the main route of the canal, some sixty miles in length, stretched through a country full of engineering difficulties. Moreover the canal was planned on an unusually large scale, for use by ships of war; it was to have been 110 feet wide at the entrance. From the nature of the ground at the north-eastern and south-western termini of the canal immense labour was required to provide basins from which in all twenty-eight locks had to be constructed from the entrance locks at each extremity, so as to reach the highest point on the canal a hundred feet above high-water mark. Between Loch Eil, which was to be the southernmost point of the canal, and the loch next to it on the north, Loch Lochy, the distance was only eight miles, but the difference between their levels was ninety feet. It was necessary to connect them by a series of eight gigantic locks, to which Telford gave the name of 'Neptune's Staircase.' The works were commenced at the beginning of 1804, but it was not until October 1822 that the first vessel traversed the canal from sea to sea. It had cost nearly a million sterling, twice the amount of the original estimate. Still worse, it proved to be almost useless in comparison with the expectations which Telford had formed of its commercial promise. This was the one great disappointment of his professional career. His own theory for the financial failure of the canal was that, while he had reckoned on a very profitable trade in timber to be conveyed from the Baltic to the western ports of Great Britain and to Ireland, this hope was defeated by the policy of the government and of parliament in levying an almost prohibitory duty on Baltic

timber in favour of that of Canada. He himself reaped little pecuniary profit from the time and labour which he devoted to the canal. As its engineer-in-chief during twenty-one years he received in that capacity only 237*l.* per annum.

While engaged in these Scottish undertakings, Telford was also busily occupied in England. He had numerous engagements to construct and improve canals. In two instances he was called on to follow, with improved machinery and appliances, where Brindley had led the way. One was the substitution of a new tunnel for that which had been made by Brindley, but had become inadequate, at Harecastle Hill in Staffordshire on the Grand Junction canal; another was the improvement, sometimes amounting to reconstruction, of Brindley's Birmingham canal, which at the point of its entrance into Birmingham had become 'little better than a crooked ditch.' Long before this Telford's reputation as a canal-maker had procured him a continental reputation. In 1808-10 he planned and personally contributed to the construction of the Gotthard canal, to complete the communication between the Baltic and the North Sea. Presenting difficulties similar to those which he had overcome in the case of the Caledonian canal, the work was on a much larger scale, the length of the artificial canal which had to be made to connect the lakes being 55 miles, and that of the whole navigation 120 miles. In Sweden he was fêted as a public benefactor, and the king conferred on him the Swedish order of knighthood, honours of a kind never bestowed on him at home.

The improvement of old and the construction of new roads in England were required by the industrial development of the country, bringing with it an increased need for safe and rapid postal communication. A parliamentary committee in 1814 having reported on the ruinous and dangerous state of the roads between Carlisle and Glasgow, the legislature found it desirable, from the national importance of the route, to vote 50,000*l.* for its improvement. Sixty-nine miles, two-thirds of the new and improved road, were placed under Telford's charge, and, like all his English roads, it was constructed with a solidity greater than that obtained by the subsequent and more popular system of Macadam. Of Telford's other English road improvements the most noticeable were those through which the mountainous regions of North Wales were permeated by roads with their accompanying bridges, while through the creation of a new and safe route, under the direction of a parliamentary commission, from

Shrewsbury to Holyhead, communication between London and Dublin, to say nothing of the benefits conferred on the districts traversed, was greatly facilitated. But the very increase of traffic thus caused made only more apparent the inconvenience and peril attached to the transit of passengers and goods in open ferry-boats over the dangerous straits of Menai. It was resolved that they should be bridged. The task having been entrusted to Telford, the execution of it was one of his greatest engineering achievements.

Telford's design for the Menai bridge was based on the suspension principle, of which few English engineers had hitherto made any practical trial. Telford's application of it at Menai was on a scale of enormous magnitude. When it had been approved by eminent experts, and recommended by a select committee of the House of Commons, parliament granted the money required for the execution of the scheme. The main chains of wrought iron on which the roadway was to be laid were sixteen in number, and the distance between the piers which supported them was no less than 550 feet; the pyramids, this being the form which the piers assumed at their utmost elevation, were 53 feet above the level of the roadway, and the height of each of the two principal piers on which the main chains of the bridge were to be suspended was 153 feet. The first stone of the main pier was laid in August 1819, but it was not until six years afterwards that things were sufficiently advanced for the difficult operation of hoisting into position the first of the main chains, weighing 23½ tons between the points of suspension. On 26 April 1825 an enormous assemblage on the banks of the straits witnessed the operation, and hailed its success with loud and prolonged cheering. Telford himself had come from London to Bangor to superintend the operations. Anxiety respecting their result had kept him sleepless for weeks. It is said that when on the eventful day some friends came to congratulate him on his success, they found him on his knees engaged in prayer. Soon afterwards, in 1826, Telford erected a suspension bridge on the same principle as that at Menai over the estuary of the Conway.

During the speculative mania of 1825-6 a good many railways were projected, among them one in 1825 for a line from London to Liverpool. The canal proprietors, alarmed at the threatened competition with their water-ways, consulted Telford, whose advice was that the existing canal systems should

be made as complete as possible. Accordingly he was commissioned to design the Birmingham and Liverpool junction from a point on the Birmingham canal near Wolverhampton to Ellesmere Port on the Mersey, an operation by which a second communication was established between Birmingham on the one hand, and Liverpool and Manchester on the other. This was the last of Telford's canals. It is said that he declined the appointment of engineer to the projected Liverpool and Manchester railway because it might injuriously affect the interests of the canal proprietors.

Among the latest works planned by Telford, and executed after he was seventy, were the fine bridges at Tewkesbury (1826); a cast-iron bridge of one arch, and that at Gloucester (1828) of one large stone arch; the St. Katherine Docks at London, opened in 1828; the noble Dean Bridge at Edinburgh (1831); the skilfully planned North Level drainage in the Fen country (1830-4); and the great bridge over the Clyde at Glasgow (1833-5), which was not opened until rather more than a year after Telford's death. His latest professional engagement was in 1834, when, at the request of the great Duke of Wellington, as lord warden of the Cinque ports, he visited Dover and framed a plan for the improvement of its harbour.

During his latest years, when he had retired from active employment and deafness diminished his enjoyment of society, he drew up a detailed account of his chief engineering enterprises, to which he prefixed a fragment of autobiography. Telford was one of the founders, in 1818, of the society which became the Institute of Civil Engineers. He was its first president, and sedulously fostered its development, bestowing on it the nucleus of a library, and aiding strenuously in procuring for it a charter of incorporation in 1828. The institute received from him its first legacy, amounting to 2,000*l*.

Telford died at 24 Abingdon Street, Westminster, on 2 Sept. 1834. He was buried on 10 Sept. in Westminster Abbey, near the middle of the nave. In the east aisle of the north transept there is a fine statue of him by Bailey. A portrait by Sir Henry Raeburn belonged to Mrs. Burge in 1867 (*Cat. of Portrait Exhibition at South Kensington*, 1868; No. 166). A second portrait, by Lane, belongs to the Institute of Civil Engineers.

Although Telford was unmarried and his habits were inexpensive, he did not die rich. At the end of his career his investments brought him in no more than 800*l*. a year. He thought less of professional gain than of the benefits conferred on his country by

his labours. So great was his disinterested zeal for the promotion of works of public utility that in the case of the British Fisheries Society, the promoters of which were animated more by public spirit than by the hope of profit, while acting for many years as its engineer he refused any remuneration for his labour, or even payment for the expenditure which he incurred in its service. His professional charges were so moderate that, it is said, a deputation of representative engineers once formally expostulated with him on the subject (SMILES, p. 317). He carried his indifference to money matters so far that, when making his will, he fancied himself worth only 16,000*l*. instead of the 30,000*l*. which was found to be the real amount. He was a man of a kindly and generous disposition. He showed his lifelong attachment to his native district, the scene of his humble beginnings, not merely by reproducing as soon as he became prosperous the poem on Eskdale which he had written when he was a journeyman mason, but by remitting sums of money every winter for the benefit of its poorer inhabitants. He also bequeathed to aid in one case, and to establish in another, free public libraries at Westerkirk and Langholm in his native valley.

Telford was of social disposition, a blithe companion, and full of anecdote. His personality was so attractive as considerably to increase the number of visitors to and customers of the Salopian coffee-house, afterwards the Ship hotel, which for twenty-one years he made his headquarters in London. He came to be considered a valuable fixture of the establishment. When he left it to occupy a house of his own in Abingdon Street, a new landlord of the Salopian, who had just entered into possession, was indignant. 'What!' he exclaimed, 'leave the house? Why, sir, I have just paid 750*l*. for you!' (SMILES, p. 302).

Telford's love of literature and of verse-writing clung to him from his early days. At one of the busiest periods of his life he is found now criticising Goethe and Kotzebue, now studying Dugald Stewart on the human mind and Alison on taste. He was the warm friend of Thomas Campbell and of Southey. He formed a strong attachment to Campbell after the appearance of the 'Pleasures of Hope,' and acted to him as his helpful mentor. Writing to Dr. Currie in 1802, Campbell says: 'I have become acquainted with Telford the engineer; a fellow of infinite humour and of strong enterprising mind. He has almost made me a bridge-builder already; at least he has inspired me

with new sensations of interest in the improvement and ornament of our country. Telford is a most useful cicerone in London. He is so universally acquainted and so popular in his manners that he can introduce one to all kinds of novelty and all descriptions of interesting society. Campbell is said to have been staying with Telford at the Salopian when writing 'Hohenlinden,' and to have adopted 'important emendations' suggested by Telford (SMILES, p. 384). Telford became godfather to his eldest son, and bequeathed Campbell 500*l*. He left a legacy of the same amount to Southey, to whom it came very seasonably, and who said of Telford, 'A man more heartily to be liked, more worthy to be esteemed and admired, I have never fallen in with.' There is an agreeable account by Southey of a tour which he made with Telford in the highlands and far north of Scotland in 1819. He records in it the vivid impressions made on him by Telford's roads, bridges, and harbours, and by what was then completed of the Caledonian canal. Extracts from Southey's narrative were first printed by Dr. Smiles in his 'Life of Telford.' Southey's last contribution to the 'Quarterly Review' (March 1839) was a very genial and appreciative article on Telford's career and character.

Southey's article was a review of an elaborate work which appeared in 1838, as the 'Life of Thomas Telford, Civil Engineer, written by himself, containing a Descriptive Narrative of his Professional Labours, with a Folio Atlas and Copper Plates, edited by John Rickman, one of his Executors, with a Preface, Supplement, Annotations, and Index.' In this volume Telford's accounts of his various engineering enterprises, great and small, are ample and luminous. Rickman added biographical traits and anecdotes of Telford. The supplement contains many elucidations of his professional career and a few of his personal character, among the former being his reports to parliament, &c., and those of parliamentary commissioners under whose supervision some of the most important of his enterprises were executed. In one of the appendices his poem on 'Eskdale' is reprinted. There is also a copy of his will. 'Some Account of the Inland Navigation of the County of Salop' was contributed by Telford to Archdeacon Plymley's 'General View of the Agriculture of Shropshire' (London, 1802). He also wrote for Sir David Brewster's 'Edinburgh Encyclopædia,' to the production of which work he gave financial assistance, the articles on 'Bridges,' 'Civil Architecture,' and 'Inland

Navigation;' in the first of these, presumably from his want of mathematical knowledge, he was assisted by A. Nimmo.

[The personal as distinguished from the professional autobiography of Telford given in the volume edited by Rickman is meagre, and ceases with his settlement at Shrewsbury. The one great authority for Telford's biography is Dr. Smiles's *Life*, 1st ed. 1861; 2nd ed. 1887 (to which all the references in the preceding article are made). Dr. Smiles threw much new and interesting light on Telford's personal character, as well as on his professional career, by publishing for the first time extracts from Telford's letters to his old schoolfellow in Eskdale, Andrew Little of Langholm. There is a valuable article by Sir David Brewster on Telford as an engineer in the 'Edinburgh Review' for October 1839. Telford as a road-maker is dealt with exhaustively in Sir Henry Parnell's *Treatise on Roads*, wherein the Principles on which Roads should be made are explained and illustrated by the Plans, Specifications, and Contracts made use of by Thomas Telford, Esq., London, 1833.] F. E.

TELYNOG (1840-1865), Welsh poet. [See EVANS, THOMAS.]

TEMPEST, PIERCE (1653-1717), printseller, born at Tong, Yorkshire, in July 1653, was the sixth son of Henry Tempest of Tong by his wife, Mary Bushall, and brother of Sir John Tempest, first baronet. It is said that he was a pupil and assistant of Wenceslaus Hollar [q. v.], and some of the prints which bear his name as the publisher have been assumed to be his own work; but there is no actual evidence that he ever practised engraving. Establishing himself in the Strand as a book and print seller about 1680, Tempest issued some sets of plates of birds and beasts etched by Francis Place and John Griffier from drawings by Francis Barlow; a few mezzotint portraits by Place and others, chiefly of royal personages; and a translation of C. Ripa's 'Iconologia,' 1709. But he is best known by the celebrated 'Cryes of the City of London,' which he published in 1711, a series of seventy-four portraits, from drawings by Marcellus Laroon the elder [q. v.], of itinerant dealers and other remarkable characters who at that time frequented the streets of the metropolis; the plates were probably all engraved by John Savage (fl. 1690-1700) [q. v.], whose name appears upon one of them. Tempest died on 1 April 1717, and was buried at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, London. There is a mezzotint portrait of him by Place, after G. Heemskerk, with the motto 'Cavete vobis principes,' and the figure of a nonconformist minister in the 'Cryes' is said to represent him.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Chaloner Smith's British Mezzotint Portraits; Dodd's manuscript Hist. of Engravers in Brit. Mus. (Addit. MS. 33406); information from Major Tempest of Broughton Hall.] F. M. O'D.

TEMPLE, EARL. [See GRANVILLE, RICHARD TEMPLE, 1711-1779.]

TEMPLE, HENRY, first VISCOUNT PALMERSTON (1673?-1757), born about 1673, was the eldest surviving son of Sir John Temple, speaker of the Irish House of Commons [see under TEMPLE, SIR JOHN]. On 21 Sept. 1680, when about seven years old, he was appointed, with Luke King, chief remembrancer of the court of exchequer in Ireland, for their joint lives, and on King's death the grant was renewed to Temple and his son Henry for life (8 June 1716). It was then worth nearly 2,000*l.* per annum (SWIFT, *Works*, 1883 ed. vi. 416). Temple was created, on 12 March 1722-3, a peer of Ireland as Baron Temple of Mount Temple, co. Sligo, and Viscount Palmerston of Palmerston, co. Dublin. He sat in the English House of Commons for East Grinstead, Sussex, 1727-34, Bossiney, Cornwall, 1734-1741; and Weobly, Herefordshire, 1741-47, and was a supporter of Sir Robert Walpole's administration. In the interest of Walpole he offered Dr. William Webster in 1734 a crown pension of 300*l.* per annum if he would turn the 'Weekly Miscellany' into a ministerial paper (NICHOLS, *Lit. Anecdotes*, v. 162). Sir Charles Hanbury Williams wrote several skits upon 'Little Broadbottom Palmerston' (*Works*, i. 189, ii. 265, iii. 36). He was cured at Bath in 1736 of a severe illness (WILLIAM OLIVER, *Practical Essay on Warm Bathing*, 2nd edit. pp. 60-2). Palmerston added the garden front to the house at East Sheen (LYSONS, *Environs*, i. 371), and greatly improved the mansion of Broadlands, near Romsey, Hampshire (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 14th Rep. App. ix. 251). The volume of 'Poems on several Occasions' (1736) by Stephen Duck [q. v.], the 'thresher,' patronised by Queen Caroline, includes 'A Journey to Marlborough, Bath,' inscribed to Viscount Palmerston. Part of the poem describes a feast given by the peer annually on 30 June to the threshers of the village of Charlton, between Pewsey and Amesbury, Wiltshire, in honour of Duck, a native of that place. The dinner is still given every year, and its cost is partly provided from the rent of a piece of land given by Lord Palmerston.

Palmerston was a correspondent of the Duchess of Marlborough, and some angry letters passed between him and Swift in January 1725-6 (*Works*, 1883 edit. xvii. 23-

29). He helped Bishop Berkeley in his scheme concerning the island of St. Christopher (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 7th Rep. App. p. 242), and he presented to Eton College in 1750 four large volumes on heraldry, which had been painted for Henry VIII by John Tirol (*ib.* 9th Rep. App. i. 357). He died at Chelsea on 10 June 1757, aged 84.

He married, first, Anne, only daughter of Abraham Houblon, governor of the Bank of England. She died on 8 Dec. 1735, having had issue, with other children, a son Henry, who married, on 18 June 1735, Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Colonel Lee, whose widow, Lady Elizabeth, had become in May 1731 the wife of Edward Young the poet. Henry Temple's wife died of consumption at Montpellier, on her way to Nice, in October 1736. He was usually considered the Philander, and his wife was certainly the Narcissa, of Young's 'Night Thoughts' (Night iii.). As a protestant she was denied Christian burial at Montpellier, and was finally buried in the old protestant burial-ground of the Hôtel-Dieu at Lyons, 729 livres having been paid for permission to inter her remains there (MURRAY, *Handbook to France*, 1892, ii. 27). The widower married, on 12 Sept. 1738, Jane, youngest daughter of Sir John Barnard [q. v.], lord mayor of London, and left at his decease, on 18 Aug. 1740, Henry Temple, second viscount Palmerston [q. v.]. The first Lord Palmerston married as his second wife, 11 May 1738, Isabella, daughter of Sir Francis Gerard, bart., and relict of Sir John Fryer, bart. She died on 10 Aug. 1762.

[Burke's Extinct Peerage; Lodge's Irish Peerage, ed. Archdall, v. 240-4; Chester's Westminster Abbey Registers, pp. 7, 382; Johnson's Poets, ed. Cunningham, iii. 330-2.] W. P. C.

TEMPLE, HENRY, second VISCOUNT PALMERSTON (1739-1802), son of Henry Temple (d. 1740) by his second wife, and grandson of Henry, first viscount [q. v.], was born on 4 Dec. 1739. At a by-election on 28 May 1762 he was returned to parliament in the interest of the family of Buller for the Cornish borough of East Looe, and sat for it until 1768. He subsequently represented the constituencies of Southampton (1768-74), Hastings (1774-80 and 1780-84), Boroughbridge in Yorkshire (1784-90), Newport, Isle of Wight (1790-96), and Winchester (1796 to death). He seconded the address in December 1765. In the same month he was appointed to a seat at the board of trade. From September 1766 to December 1777 he was a lord of the admiralty, and from the latter date to the accession of the Rockingham ministry in March 1782 he was a lord of the

treasury. He was a member of the committee nominated by Lord North in November 1772 to inquire into the affairs of the East India Company, but he did not attain to distinction in political life.

Throughout his life Palmerston was fond of travel, of social life, and of the company of distinguished men. He was walking with Wilkes in the streets of Paris in 1763 when the patriot was challenged by a Scotsman serving in the French army. Late in the same year he passed through Lausanne, when Gibbon praised his scheme of travel and prophesied that he would derive great improvement from it. He was elected a member of the Catch Club in 1771, and Gibbon dined with him on 20 May 1776 at 'a great dinner of Catches.' He was created a D.C.L. of Oxford on 7 July 1773. At his first nomination on 1 July 1783 for 'The Club' he was, against Johnson's opinion, rejected; but on 10 Feb. 1784 he was duly elected (BOSWELL, ed. Napier, iv. 163). A letter from him in 1777 is in Garrick's 'Correspondence' (ii. 270-1); Sir Joshua Reynolds often dined at his house, and Palmerston was one of the pall-bearers at the funerals of Garrick and Reynolds. Under the will of Sir Joshua he had the second choice of any picture painted by him, and he selected the 'Infant Academy.'

William Pars [q. v.] accompanied Palmerston to the continent in 1767, and made many drawings of scenes which they visited. When at Spa they met Frances, only daughter of Sir Francis Poole, bart., of Poole Hall, Chester. She was ten years older than Lord Palmerston, but 'agreeable, sensible, and so clever,' that, although he desired a fortune and she was poor, he married her on 6 Oct. 1767 (MRS. OSBORN, *Letters*, p. 174; *Notes and Queries*, 4th ser. vii. 340). She died at the Admiralty, Whitehall, London, on 1 June 1769, having had a daughter born on 17 May, and was buried in a vault under the abbey church of Romsey, Hampshire. A mural tablet to her memory, with an inscription in prose by her husband, was placed under its west window. His lines on her death, beginning with the words

Whoe'er, like me, with trembling anguish brings
His heart's whole treasure to fair Bristol's springs,

have been much admired, and are often attributed to Mason.

Palmerston married, as his second wife, at Bath, on 5 Jan. 1783, Mary, daughter of Benjamin Thomas Mee, and sister of Benjamin Mee, director of the Bank of England; like her husband, she revelled in society. The house at Sheen, their favourite resort, is de-

scribed as 'a predigious, great, old-fashioned house, with pleasure-grounds of 70 acres, pieces of water, artificial mounts, and so forth;' and their assemblies at the town house in Hanover Square were famous (DR. BURNBY, *Memoirs*, iii. 271-2). No schoolboy was 'so fond of a breaking-up as Lord Palmerston is of a junket and pleasuring.' Their life is made a 'toil of pleasure.'

Early in April 1802 Palmerston was very ill, but 'in good spirits, cracking his jokes and reading from morning to night.' He died of an ossified throat at his house in Hanover Square, London, on 16 April 1802. His widow died at Broadlands (the family seat near Romsey, Hampshire, which Palmerston had greatly enlarged and adorned) on 20 Jan. 1805. Both of them were buried in the vault under Romsey church, and against the west wall of the nave a monument, by Flaxman, was erected to their memory. Of their large family, the eldest was the statesman, Henry John Temple, third viscount Palmerston [q. v.]

Palmerston's 'Diary in France during July and August 1791' was published at Cambridge in 1885 as an appendix to 'The Despatches of Earl Gower, English Ambassador at Paris' (ed. O. Browning).

Verses by Lord Palmerston are in Lady Miller's 'Poetical Amusements at a Villa near Bath' (i. 12, 52-7, 60-3), the 'New Foundling Hospital for Wit' (i. 51-9), and Walpole's 'Royal and Noble Authors' (ed. Park, v. 327-8). Those in the first of these collections are described by Walpole as 'very pretty' (*Letters*, vi. 171), but they were ridiculed by Tickell in his satire, 'The Wreath of Fashion.' His mezzotint portraits were sold by Christie & Manson in May 1890; his pictures in April 1891.

[Lodge's *Irish Peerage*, ed. Archdall, v. 244; Foster's *Alumni Oxon.*; *Gent. Mag.* 1802 i. 381, 1805 p. 95; Spence's *Romsey Church*, pp. 40-2; Brayley and Britton's *Beauties of England and Wales*, vi. 223; Pratt's *Harvest Home*, i. 78; Courtney's *Parl. Rep. of Cornwall*, p. 124; Grenville Papers, i. 413-6; *Notes and Queries*, 1st ser. i. 382, v. 620, 3rd ser. i. 383; Walpole's *Journals*, 1771-1783, i. 168, ii. 174; Croker Papers, i. 17; Nichols's *Lit. Anecdotes*, vii. 4; Wooll's *Warton*, p. 84; Walpole's *Letters*, vi. 178, 217, 269-70, vii. 54; Alger's *Englishmen in the French Revolution*, pp. 105-7; *Chatham Corresp.* ii. 350; Lord Minto's *Life*, passim; Gibbon's *Letters*, i. 50, 283; Leslie and Taylor's *Sir Joshua Reynolds*, i. 380, 386, ii. 53, 414, 632, 636.] W. P. C.

TEMPLE, HENRY JOHN, third Viscount PALMERSTON in the peerage of Ireland (1784-1865), statesman, was the elder

son of Henry Temple, second viscount of Althorp, by his second wife, Mary, daughter of Benjamin Thomas Mee of Bath. He was born at his father's English estate, Broadlands, Hampshire, on 20 Oct. 1784. Much of his childhood was spent abroad, chiefly in Italy, and at home his education was begun by an Italian refugee named Ravizzotti; but in 1795 he entered Harrow, where he rose to be a monitor, and thrice 'declaimed' in Latin and English at speeches in 1800. Althorp and Aberdeen were among his schoolfellows. In 1800 he was sent to Edinburgh to board with Dugald Stewart [q.v.] and attend his lectures. Here, says Lord Palmerston (in a fragment of autobiography written in 1830), 'I laid the foundation for whatever useful knowledge and habits of mind I possess.' Stewart gave him a very high character in every respect; and to moral qualities the boy added the advantage of a strikingly handsome face and figure, which afterwards procured him the nickname of 'Cupid' among his intimates. From Edinburgh he proceeded to Cambridge, where he was admitted to St. John's College on 4 April 1803 (*Register of the College*). Dr. Outram, afterwards a canon of Lichfield, was his private tutor, and commended his pupil's 'regularity of conduct.' At the college examinations Henry Temple was always in the first class, and he seems to have regarded the Cambridge studies as somewhat elementary after his Edinburgh training. He joined the Johnian corps of volunteers, and thus early showed his interest, never abated, in the national defences. He did not matriculate in the university till 27 Jan. 1806, and on the same day he proceeded master of arts without examination, *jure natalium*, as was then the privilege of noblemen (*Reg. Univ. Cambr.*) By this time he had succeeded to the Irish peerage on his father's death on 16 April 1802.

In 1806, while still only an 'inceptor,' he stood in the tory interest for the seat of Burgess for the university, vacant by the death of Pitt, and, though Lord Henry Petty won the contest, Palmerston was only seventeen votes below Althorp, the second candidate. In the same year, at the general election, he was returned for Horsham at a cost of 1,500*l.*; but there was a double return, and he was unseated on petition 20 Jan. 1807. After again contesting Cambridge University in May 1807, and failing by only four votes, he soon afterwards found a seat at Newtown, Isle of Wight, a pocket borough of Sir Leonard Holmes, who exacted the curious stipulation that the candidate, even at elections, should 'never set foot in the place.'

By the influence of his grandfather, Lord Malmesbury, he had already (3 April 1807) been appointed a lord of the admiralty in the Portland administration, and his first speech (3 Feb. 1808) related to a naval measure. He rose to defend the government against an attack directed upon them for not laying before the house full papers on the recent expedition to Denmark. The speech was a vindication of the necessity of secrecy in diplomatic correspondence. Although a rare and only on great occasions an eloquent speaker, he was a close observer of current political movements, and a journal which he kept from 1806 to 1808 shows that he early devoted particular attention to foreign affairs. In October 1809 the new prime minister, Spencer Perceval, offered Palmerston conditionally the choice of the post of chancellor of the exchequer, of a junior lordship of the treasury with an understood succession to the exchequer, or of secretary at war with a seat in the cabinet. The young man consulted Lord Malmesbury and other friends, but he had already made up his mind. He clearly realised the dangers of premature promotion, and accordingly declined the higher office, accepting the post of secretary at war, but without a seat in the cabinet. He was sworn of the privy council on 1 Nov. 1809.

Palmerston entered upon his duties at the war office on 27 Oct. 1809, and held his post for nearly twenty years (till 1828) under the five administrations respectively of Perceval, Lord Liverpool, Canning, Lord Goderich, and (for a few months) the Duke of Wellington. Apparently he was content with his work, for he successively declined Lord Liverpool's offers of the post of chief secretary for Ireland, governor-general of India, and the post office with an English peerage. Like not a few English statesmen of high family and social tastes, he had at that time little ambition, and performed his official labours more as a duty to his country than as a step to power. He was, in fact, a man of fashion, a sportsman, a bit of a dandy, a light of Almack's, and all that this implied; also something of a wit, writing parodies for the 'New Whig Guide.' His steady attachment to his post is the more remarkable, since the duties of the secretary at war were mainly concerned with dreary financial calculations, while the secretary for war controlled the military policy. Palmerston held that it was his business to stand between the spending authorities—i.e. the secretary for war and the commander-in-chief—and the public, and to control and economise military expenditure in the best

interests of the country without jeopardising the utmost efficiency of its troops and defences. In the same way he maintained the 'right of *entrée* to the closet,' or personal access to the sovereign, which his predecessor had surrendered in favour of the commander-in-chief. Besides asserting the rights of his office, Palmerston had a laborious task in removing the many abuses which had crept into the administration of his department. In the House of Commons he spoke only on matters concerning his office, and maintained absolute silence upon Liverpool's repressive measures. Some of his official reforms excited the animosity of interested persons, and a mad lieutenant, Davis, attempted to assassinate him on the steps of the war office on 8 April 1818. Fortunately the ball inflicted only a slight wound in the hip, and Palmerston, with characteristic magnanimity, paid counsel to conduct the prisoner's defence.

During nearly the whole of his tenure of the war office he sat as a burgess for Cambridge University, for which he was first returned in March 1811, and was re-elected in 1812, 1818, 1820, and 1826, the last time after a keen contest with Goulburn. He was once more returned for Cambridge in December 1830, but was rejected in the following year on account of his resolute support of parliamentary reform. He complained that members of his own government used their influence against him, and recorded that this was the beginning of his breach with the tories. His next seat was Bletchingley, Surrey (18 July 1831), and when this disappeared in the Reform Act he was returned for South Hampshire (15 Dec. 1832). Rejected by the South Hampshire electors in 1834, he remained without a seat till 1 June 1835, when he found a quiet and steadfast constituency in Tiverton, of which he continued to be member up to his death, thirty years later.

With the accession of Canning to power in 1827, Palmerston received promises of promotion. Although as foreign secretary Canning had found his colleague remarkably silent, and complained that he could not drag 'that three-decker Palmerston into action' except when his own war department was the subject of discussion, the new prime minister did not hesitate to place him in the cabinet, and even to offer him the office of chancellor of the exchequer, as Perceval had done nearly twenty years before. The king, however, disliked Palmerston, and Canning had to revoke his promise. Palmerston took the change of plan with his usual good temper; but when, some time afterwards, Canning offered him

(at the king's suggestion, he explained) the governorship of Jamaica, Palmerston 'laughed so heartily' in his face that Canning 'looked quite put out, and I was obliged to grow serious again' (autobiographical fragment in ASHLEY's *Life of Palmerston*, ed. 1879, i. 105-8). Palmerston's jolly 'Ha, ha!' was a thing to be remembered. Presently Canning offered him the governor-generalship of India, as Lord Liverpool had done before, but it was declined on the score of climate and health. After the prime minister's sudden death (8 Aug. 1827) and the brief administration of 'Goody Goderich,' which expired six months later [see ROBINSON, FREDERICK JOHN], Canning's supporters, including Palmerston, resolved 'as a party' to continue in the Duke of Wellington's government. The differences, however, between the 'friends of Mr. Canning' and the older school of tories—the 'pig-tails,' as Palmerston called them—were too deep-rooted to permit an enduring alliance, and in four months (May 1828), on the pretext of the East Retford bill, the Canningites left the government, as they had entered it, 'as a party.'

Canning's influence moulded Palmerston's political convictions, especially on foreign policy. Canning's principles governed Palmerston's conduct of continental relations throughout his life. The inheritance of a portion of Canning's mantle explains the isolation and independence of Palmerston's position during nearly the whole of his career. He never belonged strictly to any party or action. Tories thought him too whiggish, and whigs suspected him of toryism, and he certainly combined some of the principles of both parties. The rupture between the Canningites and the tories threw the former into the arms of the whigs, and after 1828 Palmerston always acted with them, sometimes in combination with the Peelites or liberal-conservatives. But though he acted with whigs, and liked them and agreed with them much more than with the tories (as he wrote to his brother, Sir William Temple, 18 Jan. 1828), he never was a true whig, much less a true liberal. He pledged himself to no party, but judged every question on its merits.

During the two years of opposition in the House of Commons, Palmerston's attention was closely fixed upon the continental complications, especially in Portugal and Greece. On 1 June 1829 he made his first great speech on foreign affairs, his first public declaration of foreign policy, and his first decided oratorical success. He denounced the government's countenance of Dom Miguel, lamented that England had not shared with France

the honour of expelling the Egyptians from the Morea, and ridiculed the absurdity of creating 'a Greece which should contain neither Athens, nor Thebes, nor Marathon, nor Salamis, nor Plataea, nor Thermopylae, nor Missolonghi.' In home affairs he interfered but little. Since 1812 he had consistently advocated and voted for catholic emancipation; he had voted against the dissenters' disabilities bill in 1828 because no provision had been made on behalf of the Roman catholics; and in the great debate of 1829 he spoke (18 March) with much spirit on behalf of emancipation, which he predicted, in his sanguine way, would 'give peace to Ireland.' His influence and reputation had by this time grown so considerable that the Duke of Wellington twice sought his co-operation in 1830 as a member of his cabinet; but, apart from other differences, Palmerston's advocacy of parliamentary reform made any such alliance impossible.

When Lord Grey formed his administration in 1830 Palmerston became (22 Nov.) secretary of state for foreign affairs, and he held the office for the next eleven years continuously, except for the four months (December 1834 to April 1835) during which Sir Robert Peel was premier. His first negotiation was one of the most difficult and perhaps the most successful of all. The Belgians, smarting under the tyranny of the Dutch and inspired by the Paris revolution of July, had risen on 28 Aug. 1830, and severed the factitious union of the Netherlands which the Vienna congress had set up as a barrier against French expansion. The immediate danger was that Belgium, if defeated by Holland, would appeal to the known sympathy of France, and French assistance might develop into French annexation, or at least involve the destruction of the barrier fortresses. The Belgians were fully aware of England's anxiety on this point, and played their cards with skill. Lord Aberdeen, who was at the foreign office when the revolution took place, wisely summoned a conference of the representatives of the five powers, when it became evident that the autocratic states, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, were all for maintaining the provisions of the treaty of 1815, and Russia even advocated a forcible restoration of the union. They agreed, however, in arranging an armistice between the belligerents pending negotiations. Palmerston, coming into office in November, saw that the Belgians could not go longer in double harness, and, supported by France, he succeeded within a month in inducing the conference to consent (20 Dec.) to the independence of Belgium

as a neutral state guaranteed by the powers, who all pledged themselves to seek no increase of territory in connection with the new arrangement. If it was difficult to get the autocratic powers to agree to the separation, it was even harder to persuade France to sign the self-denying clause, and the attainment of both objects is a striking testimony to Palmerston's diplomatic skill. The articles of peace were signed by the five powers on 27 Jan. 1831. The Dutch accepted but the Belgians refused them, and, in accordance with their policy of playing off France against England, they proceeded to elect as their king Louis-Philippe's son, the Duc de Nemours. Palmerston immediately informed the French government that the acceptance of the Belgian crown by a French prince meant war with England, and he prevailed upon the conference still sitting in London to agree to reject any candidate who belonged to the reigning families of the five powers. France alone stood out, and some irritation was displayed at Paris, inasmuch that Palmerston had to instruct our ambassador (15 Feb. 1831) to inform Sebastiani that 'our desire for peace will never lead us to submit to affront either in language or in act.' So early had the 'Palmerstonian style' been adopted. Louis-Philippe had the sense to decline the offer for his son, and, after further opposition, the Belgians elected Prince Leopold as their king, and accepted the London articles (slightly modified in their favour) on Palmerston's ultimatum of 29 May. It was now the turn of the Dutch to refuse; they renewed the war and defeated the Belgian army. France went to the rescue, and the dangers of French occupation again confronted the cabinet. It demanded the finest combination of tact and firmness on the part of Palmerston to secure on 15 Sept. 1832 the definite promise of the unconditional withdrawal of the French army. On 15 Nov. a final act of separation was signed by the conference, and, after some demur, accepted by Belgium. Holland still held out, and Antwerp was bombarded by the French, while an English squadron blocked the Scheldt. The city surrendered on 23 Dec. 1832; the French army withdrew according to engagement; five of the frontier fortresses were dismantled without consultation with France; and Belgium was thenceforward free. The independence of Belgium has been cited as the most enduring monument of Palmerston's diplomacy. It was the first stone dislodged from the portentous fabric erected by the congress of Vienna, and the change has stood the test of time. Belgium

was the only continental state, save Russia, that passed through the storm of 1848 unmoved.

Palmerston had always taken a sympathetic interest in the struggle of the Greeks for independence, and had opposed in the Wellington cabinet of 1828, and afterwards in parliament, the limitation of the new state of Greece to the Morea. He alone in the cabinet had advocated as early as 1827, in Godefrich's time, the despatch of a British force to drive out Ibrahim Pasha, and had consistently maintained that the only frontier for Greece against Turkey was the line from Volo to Arta which had been recommended by Sir Stratford Canning and the other commissioners at Poros, but overruled by Lord Aberdeen. When Palmerston came into office he sent Sir Stratford on a special embassy to Constantinople, and this frontier was at last conceded by Turkey on 22 July 1832 (LANE-POOLE, *Life of Stratford Canning*, i. 498).

The troubles in Portugal and Spain engaged the foreign secretary's vigilant attention. He had condemned the perjury of the usurper Miguel while in opposition, and when in office he sent him 'a peremptory demand for immediate and full redress' in respect to the British officers imprisoned at Lisbon, which was at once complied with. On the arrival of Dom Pedro, however, in July 1832, to assert his own and his daughter's interests, Miguel began a series of cruel persecutions and arbitrary terrorism, which filled the gaols and produced general anarchy. English and French officers were actually maltreated in the streets. Both countries sent ships of war to protect their subjects, and Dom Pedro was supported by a large number of English volunteers. Palmerston hoped to work upon the moderate ministry in Spain, which had just replaced the 'apostolicals,' and induce them to co-operate in getting rid of Dom Miguel, whose court was a rallying point for their opponents, and in sending Dom Pedro back to Brazil. He founded this hope partly on the analogy between Spain and Portugal in the disputed succession, a daughter and a rival uncle being the problem in each case. Accordingly he sent Sir Stratford Canning on a special mission to Madrid, near the close of 1832, to propose 'the establishment of Donna Maria on the throne as queen [of Portugal], and the relinquishment by Dom Pedro of his claim to the regency during the minority of his daughter' (*Life of Stratford Canning*, ii. 25). Though Queen Christina of Spain was favourable, Canning found the king, Ferdinand VII, and his minister, Zea Ber-

mudez, obdurate, and returned to England without accomplishing his purpose. Before this Palmerston's Portuguese policy had been censured in the House of Lords, but the commons had approved the support of Donna Maria and constitutionalism, and recognised that our friendly and almost protective relations with Portugal justified our interference. The death of Ferdinand, on 29 Sept. 1833, created in Spain, as was foreseen, a situation closely parallel to that in Portugal. Ferdinand, with the consent of the cortes, had repealed the pragmatic sanction of 1713 in favour of his daughter Isabella, who thus became queen; while her uncle, Don Carlos, like Miguel in Portugal, denied the validity of her succession, and claimed the throne for himself. In this double crisis Palmerston played what he rightly called 'a great stroke.' By his sole exertions a quadruple alliance was constituted by a treaty signed on 22 April 1834 by England, France, Spain, and Portugal, in which all four powers pledged themselves to expel both Miguel and Carlos from the peninsula. He wrote in high glee (to his brother, 21 April 1834): 'I carried it through the cabinet by a *coup de main*.' Beyond its immediate purpose, he hoped it would 'serve as a powerful counterpoise to the holy alliance.' The mere rumour was enough for the usurpers: Miguel and Carlos fled from the peninsula. But France soon showed signs of defection. Palmerston seems to have wounded the sensibility of 'old Talley,' as he called him; and Talleyrand, on his return to Paris in 1835, is said to have avenged this by setting Louis-Philippe against him. The late cordiality vanished, and Spain was again plunged in anarchy. The presence of a British squadron on the coast and the landing of an auxiliary legion under De Lacy Evans did little good, and aroused very hostile criticism in England. Sir H. Hardinge moved an address to the king censuring the employment of British troops in Spain without a declaration of war; but after three nights' debate Palmerston got up, and in a fine speech lasting three hours turned the tables on his opponents, and carried the house completely with him. The government had a majority of thirty-six, and the minister was cheered 'riotously.' His Spanish policy had achieved something. 'The Carlist cause failed,' as he said; 'the cause of the constitution prevailed,' and he had also defeated the schemes of Dom Miguel in Portugal.

If France showed little cordiality towards the end of the Spanish negotiations, she was much more seriously hostile to Palmerston's eastern policy, and that policy has been more

severely criticised than perhaps any other part of his management of foreign affairs. His constant support of Turkey has been censured as an upholding of barbarism against civilisation. It must, however, be remembered that Palmerston's tenure of the foreign office from 1830 to 1841 coincided with the extraordinary revival and reforming efforts of that energetic and courageous sultan Mahmûd II, when many statesmen entertained sanguine hopes of the regeneration of Turkey. Palmerston himself did not believe that the Ottoman empire was decaying; on the contrary, he held that ten years of peace might convert it into 'a respectable power' (letters to H. Bulwer, 22 Sept. 1838, 1 Sept. 1839). Besides this hope, he was firmly convinced of the paramount importance of maintaining a barrier between Russia and the Mediterranean. Russia, however, was not the only danger. The 'eastern question' of that time presented a new feature in the formidable antagonism of a great vassal, Mohammed Ali, the pasha of Egypt. The first phase of his attack upon the sultan, culminating in the victory of Koniya (December 1832), was carried out without any interference by Palmerston. He foresaw indeed that unless the powers intervened, Russia would undertake the defence of Turkey by herself; but he failed to convince Lord Grey's cabinet of the importance of succouring the Porte. Turkey, deserted by England and by France (who, imbued with the old Napoleonic idea, encouraged the pasha), was forced to appeal to Russia, who willingly sent fifteen thousand troops to Asiatic Turkey, compelled Ibrahim to retire, and saved Constantinople. In return the tsar exacted from the sultan the treaty of Unkiar Skelesi on 8 July 1833, by which Russia acquired the right to interfere in defence of Turkey, and the Black Sea was converted into a Russian lake. Palmerston in vain protested both at Constantinople and at St. Petersburg, and even sent the Mediterranean squadron to cruise off the Dardanelles. Henceforward his eyes were open to the aggrandising policy of Russia and her hostile influence not only in Europe but in Persia and Afghanistan, which brought about Burnes's mission and the beginning of the Afghan troubles. In spite of his suspicion of Russia, however, on his return to office in 1835 under Melbourne, after Peel's brief administration, Palmerston found it necessary in 1840 to enter into an alliance with the very power he suspected, in the very quarter to which his suspicions chiefly pointed.

The cause lay in the increasing alienation of France. The policy of Louis-Philippe

and Thiers was to give Mohammed Ali a free hand, in the hope (as Rémusat admitted) that Egypt might become a respectable second-class power in the Mediterranean, bound in gratitude to support France in the contest with England that was anticipated by many observers. Palmerston had tried to induce France to join him in an engagement to defend Turkey by sea if attacked; but he had failed to bring the king or Thiers to his view, and their and Soult's response to his overtures bred in him a profound distrust of Louis-Philippe and his advisers. When, therefore, the Egyptians again overran Syria, delivered a crushing blow to the Turks at the battle of Nezib on 25 June 1839, and by the treachery of the Turkish admiral obtained possession of the Ottoman fleet, Palmerston abandoned all thoughts of joint action with France, and opened negotiations with Russia. Inaction meant dividing the Ottoman empire into two parts, of which one would be the satellite of France, and the other the dependent of Russia, while in both the interests and influence of England would be sacrificed and her prestige humiliated (to Lord Melbourne, 5 July 1840). Russia received his proposals with eagerness. Nothing was more to the mind of Nicholas than to detach Great Britain from her former cordial understanding with Louis-Philippe, and friendly negotiations rapidly arranged the quadrilateral treaty of 15 July 1840, by which England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia agreed with the Porte to drive back the Egyptians and to pacify the Levant.

Palmerston did not carry his quadrilateral alliance without considerable opposition. In the cabinet Lords Holland and Clarendon, and later Lord John Russell, were strongly against him: so, as afterwards appeared, was Melbourne; so was the court; and so was Lord Granville, the ambassador at Paris. Palmerston, however, was resolute, and placed his resignation in Melbourne's hands as the alternative to accepting his policy (GREVILLE, *Journal*, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 308). Ultimately the measure was adopted by the majority of the cabinet. The fears which had been expressed that Mohammed Ali, with French encouragement, was too strong for us, and that France would declare war, proved groundless. Palmerston had throughout maintained that Mohammed Ali was not nearly so strong as he seemed, and that Louis-Philippe was 'not the man to run amuck, especially without any adequate motive' (to H. Bulwer, 21 July 1840). Everything he prophesied came true. Beyrout, Sidon, and St. Jean d'Acre were successively taken by the British fleet under Charles Napier between

September and November 1840; Ibrahim was forced to retreat to Egypt, and Mohammed Ali was obliged to accept (11 Jan. 1841) the hereditary pashaship of Egypt, without an inch of Syria, and to restore the Turkish fleet to its rightful owner. 'Palmerston is triumphant,' wrote Greville reluctantly; 'everything has turned out well for him. He is justified by the success of his operations, and by the revelations of Thiers and Rémusat' (*loc. cit.* i. 354). French diplomacy failed to upset these arrangements; and, when the Toulon fleet was strengthened in an ominous manner, Palmerston retorted by equipping more ships, and instructed (22 Sept. 1840) Bulwer, the chargé d'affaires at Paris, to tell Thiers, 'in the most friendly and inoffensive manner possible, that if France throws down the gauntlet we shall not refuse to pick it up.' Mohammed Ali, he added, would 'just be chucked into the Nile.' The instruction was only too 'Palmerstonian'—neglect of the forms of courtesy, of the *suaviter in modo*, was his great diplomatic fault—but it had its effect. The risk of a diplomatic rupture with France vanished, and the success of the naval campaign in the Levant convinced Louis-Philippe, and led to the fall of Thiers and the succession of 'Guizot the cautious.' In the settlement of the Egyptian question Palmerston refused to allow France to have any voice; she would not join when she was wanted, and she should not meddle when she was not wanted (to Granville, 30 Nov. 1840). There was an injudicious flavour of revenge about this exclusion, and Palmerston's energetic language undoubtedly irritated Louis-Philippe, and stung him to the point of paying England off by the treachery of the Spanish marriages; but it is admitted even by Greville that Palmerston bore himself with great modesty after his triumph over France, and let no sign of exultation escape him (*loc. cit.* i. 370). The parties to the quadruple alliance concluded a convention on 13 July 1841 by which Mohammed Ali was recognised as hereditary pasha of Egypt under the definite suzerainty of the sultan, the Bosphorus and Dardanelles were closed to ships of war of every nation, and Turkey was placed formally under the protection of the guaranteeing powers. The treaty of Unkiar Skelesi was wiped out.

With the first so-called 'opium war' with China the home government had scarcely anything to do. Their distance and ignorance of Chinese policy threw the matter into the hands of the local authority. Palmerston, like the chief superintendent, of course disavowed any protection to opium smuggling,

but when Commissioner Lin declared war by banishing every foreigner from Chinese soil, there was nothing for it but to carry the contest to a satisfactory conclusion. Graham's motion of censure in April 1840 was easily defeated, and the annexation of Hong-Kong and the opening of five ports to foreign trade were important commercial acquisitions. Meanwhile to Palmerston's efforts was due the slave trade convention of the European powers of 1841. There was no object for which Palmerston worked harder throughout his career than the suppression of the slave trade. He frequently spoke on the subject in the House of Commons, where the abolition of slavery was voted in 1833 at a cost of twenty millions; 'a splendid instance,' he said, 'of generosity and justice, unexampled in the history of the world.'

By his conduct of foreign affairs from 1830 to 1841 (continuously, except for the brief interval in 1834-5 during which Peel held office) Palmerston, 'without any following in parliament, and without much influence in the country, raised the prestige of England throughout Europe to a height which it had not occupied since Waterloo. He had created Belgium, saved Portugal and Spain from absolutism, rescued Turkey from Russia, and the highway to India from France' (SANDERS, *Life*, p. 79). When he came into office he found eighteen treaties in force; when he left he had added fourteen more, some of the first magnitude. A strong foreign policy had proved, moreover, to be a policy of peace. Apart from the concerns of his department, Palmerston, as was his custom, took little part in the work or talk of the House of Commons. His reputation was far greater abroad than at home. The most important personal event of these years was his marriage, on 11 Dec. 1839, to Lord Melbourne's sister, the widow of Earl Cowper. This lady, by her charm, intellect, tact, and experience, lent a powerful support to her husband, and the informal diplomatic work accomplished at her *salon* prepared or supplemented the interviews and transactions of the foreign office.

In opposition from 1841 to 1846, during Peel's administration, Palmerston took a larger share in the debates in the House of Commons. His periodical reviews of foreign policy were looked forward to with apprehension by the tory government; for while he said that ministers were simply 'living upon our leavings,' and 'carousing upon the provisions they found in the larder,' he saw nothing but danger in Lord Aberdeen's 'antiquated imbecility' and timid use of these 'leavings'; he said the government 'purchased

temporary security by lasting sacrifices,' and he denounced the habit of making concessions (as in the Ashburton treaty with America) as fatal to a nation's interests, tranquillity, and honour. It was rumoured that he supported these opinions by articles in the 'Morning Chronicle;' and, though he denied this when in office, Aberdeen and Greville certainly attributed many of the most vehement 'leaders' to him when he was 'out' (GREVILLE, *Journal*, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 827, vol. ii. pp. 105, 109, &c.) In home affairs he was a free-trader, as he understood it, though he advocated a fixed duty on corn; he supported his intimate friend Lord Ashley (afterwards Shaftesbury) in his measures for the regulation of women's and children's labour and the limiting of hours of work in factories, and voted in 1845 for the Maynooth bill.

On 25 June 1846 Peel was defeated on the Irish coercion bill and placed his resignation in the hands of the queen. The new prime minister, Lord John Russell, naturally invited Palmerston to resume the seals of the foreign office, though the appointment was not made without apprehensions of his stalwart policy. For the third time he took up the threads of diplomacy in Downing Street on 3 July 1846. The affairs of Switzerland were then in a serious crisis: the federal diet on 20 July declared the dissentient Sonderbund of the seven Roman catholic cantons to be illegal, and in September decreed the expulsion of the jesuits from the country; civil war ensued. France suggested armed intervention and a revision of the federal constitution by the powers. Palmerston refused to agree to any use of force or to any tinkering of the constitution by outside powers; he was willing to join in mediation on certain conditions, but he wished the Swiss themselves, after the dissolution of the Sonderbund, to modify their constitution in the mode prescribed in their federal pact, as guaranteed by the powers. His chief object in debating each point in detail was to gain time for the diet, and prevent France or Austria finding a pretext for the invasion of Switzerland. In this he succeeded, and, in spite of the sympathy of France and Austria with the seven defeated cantons, the policy advocated by England was carried out, the Sonderbund was abolished, the jesuits expelled, and the federal pact re-established. Palmerston's obstinate delay and prudent advice materially contributed to the preservation of Swiss independence.

Meanwhile Louis-Philippe, who was ambitious of a dynastic union between France and Spain, avenged himself for Palmerston's

eastern policy of 1840. He had promised Queen Victoria, on her visit to him at the Château d'Eu in September 1843, to delay the marriage of his son, the Duc de Montpensier, with the younger infanta of Spain until her elder sister, the queen of Spain, was married and had issue. At the same time the pretensions to the young queen's hand alike of Prince Albert's brother Ernest, duke of Saxe-Coburg, and of the French king's eldest son were withdrawn, and it was agreed that a Spanish suitor of the Bourbon line should be chosen—either Francisco de Paula, duke of Cadiz, or his brother Enrique, duke of Seville. On 18 July 1846 Palmerston, having just returned to the foreign office, sent to the Spanish ministers an outspoken despatch condemning their misgovernment, and there fell into the error of mentioning the Duke of Coburg with the two Spanish princes as the suitors from whom the Spanish queen's husband was to be selected. The French ambassador in London protested, and Coburg's name was withdrawn. But Louis-Philippe and his minister Guizot, in defiance of the agreement of the Château d'Eu, made Palmerston's despatch the pretext for independent action. They arranged that the Duke of Cadiz, although Louis-Philippe knew him to be unfit for matrimony, should be at once united in marriage to the Spanish queen, and that that marriage and the marriage of the Duc de Montpensier with the younger infanta should be celebrated on the same day. Both marriages took place on 10 Oct. (*Annual Reg.* 1847, p. 396; D'HAUSSONVILLE, *Politique Extérieure de la France*, i. 156; ALISON, vii. 600 et seq.; SPENCER WALPOLE, v. 534; GRANIER DE CASSAGNAC, *Chute de Louis-Philippe*). The result was that the Orleanist dynasty lost the support of England, its only friend in Europe, and thereby prepared its own fall.

From the autumn of 1846 to the spring of 1847 Palmerston was anxiously engaged in dealing with the Portuguese imbroglio. His sending the fleet in November to coerce the rebellious junta and to re-establish the queen on conditions involving her return from absolutism to her former constitutional system of government, though successfully effected with the concurrence of France and Spain and the final acceptance of Donna Maria, was much criticised; but the motions of censure in both houses of parliament collapsed ludicrously. Palmerston's defence was set forth in the well-considered memorandum of 25 March 1847.

The troubles in Spain and Portugal, Switzerland and Cracow (against whose

annexation by Austria he earnestly protested) were trifles compared with the general upheaval of the 'year of revolutions.' Palmerston was not taken by surprise; he had foreseen sweeping changes and reforms, though hardly so general a movement as actually took place. In an admirable circular addressed in January 1847 to the British representatives in Italy, urged them to impress upon the Italian rulers the dangerous temper of the times, and the risk of persistent obstruction of reasonable reforms. In this spirit he had sent Lord Minto in 1847 on a special mission to the sovereigns of Italy to warn and prepare them for the popular judgment to come; but the mission came too late; the 'Young Italian' party was past control, and the princes were supine or incapable. Palmerston's personal desire was for a kingdom of Northern Italy, from the Alps to the Adriatic, under Charles Albert of Sardinia, combined with a confederation of Italian states; and he was convinced that to Austria her Italian provinces were really a source of weakness—'the heel of Achilles, and not the shield of Ajax.' He was out in his reckoning for Italian independence by some ten years, but even he could not foresee the remarkable recuperative power of Austria, whose system of government (an 'old woman,' a 'European China') he abhorred, though he fully recognised the importance of her empire as an element in the European equilibrium. Throughout the revolutionary turmoil his sympathies were frankly on the side of 'oppressed nationalities,' and his advice was always exerted on behalf of constitutional as against absolutist principles; but, to the surprise of his detractors, he maintained a policy of neutrality in diplomatic action, and left each state to mend its affairs in its own way. 'Every post,' he wrote, 'sends me a lamenting minister throwing himself and his country upon England for help, which I am obliged to tell him we cannot afford him.' The chief exception to this rule was his dictatorial lecture to the queen of Spain on 16 March 1848, which was indignantly returned, and led to Sir H. L. Bulwer's dismissal from Madrid; but even here the fault lay less with the principal than with the agent (who was not instructed to show the despatch, much less to publish it in the Spanish opposition papers), though Palmerston's loyalty to his officer forbade the admission. Another instance of indiscreet interference was the permission given to the ordnance of Woolwich to supply arms indirectly to the Sicilian insurgents. Only the unmitigated brutalities of 'Bomba' could

palliate such a breach of neutrality; but Palmerston's disgust and indignation were so widely shared by Englishmen that when he was brought to book in the commons, his defence, in 'a slashing impudent speech' (GREVILLE, *Journal*, pt. ii. vol. iii. p. 277), completely carried the house with him. His efforts in conjunction with France to mediate between Austria and Sardinia had little effect beyond procuring slightly better terms of peace for the latter; but the Marquis Massimo d'Azeglio's grateful letter of thanks (August 1849) showed how they were appreciated in Italy, and a result of this sympathy appeared later in the Sardinian contingent in the Crimean war.

The French revolution of February 1848 found no cold reception from Palmerston. 'Our principles of action,' he instructed Lord Normanby on 26 Feb., 'are to acknowledge whatever rule may be established with apparent prospect of permanency, but none other. We desire friendship and extended commercial intercourse with France, and peace between France and the rest of Europe.' He fully trusted Lamartine's sincerity and pacific intentions, and used his influence at foreign courts on his behalf. One result was seen in Lamartine's chilly reception of Smith O'Brien's Irish deputation; and the value of Palmerston's exertions in preventing friction between the powers and the French provisional government was warmly attested by the sagacious king of the Belgians, who stated (3 Jan. 1849) that this policy had assisted the French government in 'a system of moderation which it could but with great difficulty have maintained if it had not been acting in concert with England.'

The rigours adopted by Austria in suppressing the rebellions in Italy and Hungary excited England's indignant 'disgust,' as Palmerston bade Lord Ponsonby tell Prince Schwarzenberg 'openly and decidedly.' When Kossuth and other defeated leaders of the Hungarian revolution, with over three thousand Hungarian and Polish followers, took refuge in Turkey in August 1849, the ambassadors of Austria and Russia demanded their extradition. On the advice of Sir Stratford Canning, supported by the French ambassador, the sultan declined to give up the refugees. The Austrian and Russian representatives at the Porte continued to insist in violent and imperious terms, and on 4 Sept. Prince Michael Radzivil arrived at Constantinople charged with an ultimatum from the tsar, announcing that the escape of a single refugee would be taken as a declaration of war. The Turkish government, in great alarm, sought counsel with

the 'Great Elchi,' and Sir Stratford Canning [q. v.] took upon himself the responsibility of advising resolute resistance, and, in conjunction with his French colleague, allowed the Porte to understand that in the event of war Turkey would have the support of England and France (LANE POOLE, *Life of Stratford Canning*, ii. 191). Upon this the imperial ambassadors broke off diplomatic relations with the Porte. Palmerston at once obtained the consent of the cabinet to support Turkey in her generous action, and to make friendly relations at Vienna and Petersburg to induce the emperors 'not to press the Sultan to do that which a regard for his honour and the common dictates of humanity forbid him to do.' At the same time the English and French squadrons were instructed to move up to the Dardanelles with orders to go to the aid of the sultan if he should invite them (to S. Canning, 2 Oct. 1849). Palmerston was careful to explain to Baron Brunnow that this step was in no sense a threat, but merely a measure 'to prevent accidents,' and to 'comfort and support the sultan'—'like holding a bottle of salts to the nose of a lady who had been frightened.' He was fully conscious, however, of the gravity of the situation, and prepared to go all lengths in support of Turkey, 'let who will be against her' (to Ponsonby, 6 Oct. 1849). Firm language and the presence of the fleets brought the two emperors to reason, and in a fortnight Austria privately intimated that the extradition would not be insisted on.

Palmerston's chivalrous defence of the refugees brought him great renown in England, which his imprudent reception of a deputation of London radicals, overflowing with virulent abuse of the two emperors, did nothing to diminish. The 'judicious bottle-holder,' as he then styled himself, was the most popular man in the country (cf. cartoon in *Punch*, 6 Dec. 1851). The 'Pacifico affair,' which occurred shortly afterwards, tested his popularity. Two British subjects, Dr. George Finlay [q. v.] and David Pacifico [q. v.], had laid claims against the Greek government for injuries suffered by them at the hands of Greek subjects. The Greek government repudiated their right to compensation. Consequently Admiral Sir William Parker [q. v.] blockaded the Piræus in January 1850. The claims were clear, and force was used only after every diplomatic expedient had been exhausted. 'It is our long forbearance, and not our precipitation, that deserves remark,' said Palmerston. The French government offered to mediate, but on 21 April the French mediator at Athens, Baron Gros, threw up his

mission as hopeless. The coercion of Greece by the English fleet was renewed (25 April), and the Greek government compelled to accept England's terms (26 April). The renewed blockade of the Piræus was held by France to be a breach of an arrangement made in London on 18 April between Palmerston and the French ambassador, Drouyn de Lhuys. It seems that the promptness of action taken at Athens by Admiral Parker and by Thomas (afterwards Sir Thomas) Wyse [q. v.], the British minister at Athens, who was not informed of the negotiations in London, was not foreseen by the foreign secretary. It had, however, been understood all along that, if French mediation failed, coercion might be renewed without further reference to the home government (GREVILLE, *Journal*, pt. ii. vol. iii. p. 334). The French government seized the opportunity to fix a quarrel upon England in order to make a decent figure before the warlike party in the assembly at Paris. With a great show of offended integrity, and expressly on the queen's birthday, they recalled Drouyn de Lhuys from London, and in the chambers openly taxed the English government with duplicity. Those who understood French politics were not deceived. 'Oh, it's all nonsense,' said the old Duke of Wellington; and Palmerston did not think it even worth while to retaliate by recalling Lord Normanby from Paris. He hastened, on the contrary, to conciliate French susceptibilities by consulting Guizot in the final settlement of some outstanding claims upon Greece, and the storm blew over. The House of Lords indeed censured him by a majority of thirty-seven, on Lord Stanley's motion on 17 June, supported by Aberdeen and Brougham; but in the commons Roebuck's vote of confidence was carried in favour of the government by forty-six. The debate, which lasted four nights, was made memorable by the brilliant speeches of Gladstone, Cockburn, and Peel, who spoke for the last time, for his fatal accident happened next day; but the chief honours fell to Palmerston. In his famous 'civis Romanus' oration he for more than four hours vindicated his whole foreign policy with a breadth of view, a tenacity of logical argument, a moderation of tone, and a height of eloquence which the house listened to with rapture and interrupted with volleys of cheers. It was the greatest speech he ever made; 'a most able and temperate speech, a speech which made us all proud of the man who delivered it,' said Sir Robert Peel, generous to the last. It 'was an extraordinary effort,' wrote Sir George C. Lewis (to Sir E. Head, *Letters*, p. 227). 'He defeated the whole conserva-

five party, protectionists, and Peelites, supported by the extreme radicals, and backed by the "Times" and all the organised forces of foreign diplomacy.' Palmerston came through the lobby with a triumphant majority, and the conspiracy of foreign powers and English factions to overthrow him had only made him, as he said himself, 'for the present the most popular minister that for a very long course of time has held my office.' For the first time he became 'the man of the people,' 'the most popular man in the country,' said Lord Grey (GREVILLE, *loc. cit.* p. 347), and was clearly marked out as the future head of the government.

Palmerston's constant activity and disposition to tender advice or mediation in European disputes procured him the reputation of a universal intermeddler, and the blunt vigour of some of his despatches and diplomatic instructions conveyed a pugnacious impression which led to the nickname of 'firebrand;' while his jaunty, confident, off-hand air in the house gave a totally false impression of levity and indifference to serious issues. That he made numerous enemies abroad by his truculent style and stubborn tenacity of purpose is not to be denied; but the enmity of foreign statesmen is no proof of a mistaken English policy, and the result of his strong policy was peace. Just when he was at the height of his power and popularity as foreign minister an event happened which had not been unforeseen by those acquainted with the court. During the years he had held the seals of the foreign office under Lord Melbourne he had been allowed to do as he pleased in his own department. He exerted 'an absolute despotism at the F. O. . . without the slightest control, and scarcely any interference on the part of his colleagues' (GREVILLE, *Journal*, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 298). He created, in fact, an *imperium in imperio*, which, however well it worked under his able rule, was hardly likely to commend itself to a more vigilant prime minister, or to a court which conceived the regulation of foreign affairs to be its peculiar province. On several occasions Palmerston had taken upon himself to despatch instructions involving serious questions of policy without consulting the crown or his colleagues, whom he too often left in ignorance of important transactions. These acts of independence brought upon him the queen's memorandum of 12 Aug. 1850, in which he was required to 'distinctly state what he proposes in a given case, in order that the queen may know as distinctly to what she is giving her royal sanction;' and it was further commanded that a measure

once sanctioned 'be not arbitrarily altered or modified by the minister' on pain of dismissal (ASHLEY, *Life*, ii. 219). Palmerston did not resign at once, because he understood that the memorandum was confidential between Lord John Russell and himself, and he did not wish to publish to the house and country what had the air of a personal dispute between a minister and his sovereign (*ib.* ii. 226-7). He protested to Prince Albert that it was not in him to intend the slightest disrespect to the queen, pleaded extreme pressure of urgent business, and promised to comply with her majesty's instructions. But sixteen years' management of the foreign relations of England may well have bred a self-confidence and decision which brooked with difficulty the control of less experienced persons, and it would not be easy (if it were necessary) to absolve Palmerston from the charge of independence in more than the minor affairs of his office. Many instances occurred both before and after the queen's 'memorandum,' and it is clear that from 1849 onwards the court was anxious to rid itself of the foreign minister, and that eventually Lord John Russell resolved to exert his authority on the first pretext. The one he chose was flimsy enough (GREVILLE, *Journal*, pt. ii. vol. iii. p. 430; MALMESBURY, *Memoirs*, i. 301). In unofficial conversation with Count Walewski, the French ambassador, Palmerston expressed his approval of Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état* of 2 Dec. 1851, and for this he was curtly dismissed from office by Lord John Russell on the 19th, and even insulted by the offer of the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland. The pretext was considerably weakened by the fact that Lord John himself and several members of his cabinet had expressed similar opinions of the *coup d'état* to the same person at nearly the same time; but the theory seems to have been that an expression of approval from the foreign secretary to the French representative, whether official or merely 'officious,' meant a great deal more than the opinions of other members of the government. 'There was a Palmerston,' said Disraeli, and the clubs believed that the 'Firebrand' was quenched for ever. Schwarzenberg rejoiced and gave a ball, and Prussian opinion was summed up in the doggerel lines:

Hat der Teufel einen Sohn,
So ist er sicher Palmerston.

In England, however, people and press lamented, and Lord John was considered to have behaved badly. Within three weeks the government were defeated on an amendment moved by Lord Palmerston to Russell's

militia bill, and resigned. They had long been tottering, and were glad once more to avail themselves of a pretext. The result of the division was a surprise to Palmerston, who had not intended to turn them out (to his brother, 21 Feb.; LEWIS, *Letters*, p. 251).

During the 305 days of the first Derby administration Palmerston thrice refused invitations to join the conservative government. He rendered cordial aid, however, to Lord Malmesbury, the new foreign secretary (MALMESBURY, *Mem.* i. 317), and on 23 Nov. 1852 he saved the government from defeat by an adroit amendment to Villiers's free-trade resolution; but the respite was short. On 3 Dec. they were beaten on Disraeli's budget, and resigned. In the coalition government under Aberdeen, Palmerston, pressed by Lords Lansdowne and Clarendon, took the home office, the post he had settled upon beforehand as his choice in any government (to his brother, 17 Nov. 1852). He did not feel equal to 'the immense labour of the foreign office;' and probably he did not care to run the chance of further repression, though he now stood 'in better odour at Windsor' (GREVILLE, *L.c.* pt. iii. vol. i. p. 14). But before he joined the cabinet of the statesman whose foreign policy he had persistently attacked, he took care to ascertain that his own principles would be maintained. He proved an admirable home secretary, vigilant, assiduous, observant of details, original in remedies. Stimulated by Lord Shaftesbury, he introduced or supported various improvements in factory acts, carried out prison reforms, established the ticket-of-leave system and reformatory schools, and put a stop to intramural burials. He shone as a receiver of deputations, and got rid of many a troublesome interrogator with a good-humoured jest. On the question of parliamentary reform he was not in accord with Russell, and resigned on 16 Dec. 1853 on the proposals for a reform bill; but returned to office after ten days on the understanding that the details of the bill were still open to discussion. Another subject on which the cabinet disagreed was the negotiation which preceded the Crimean war. Palmerston was all for vigorous action, which, he believed, would avert war. Aberdeen, however, was tied by his secret agreement with the Emperor Nicholas, signed in 1844 (MALMESBURY, *Memoirs*, i. 402), granting the very points at issue, and was constitutionally unequal to strong measures. Of Lord Clarendon, who early in the administration succeeded Russell at the foreign office, Palmerston had a high opinion, and supported

him in the cabinet. Concession, he held, only led to more extortionate demands. 'The Russian government has been led on step by step by the apparent timidity of the government of England,' he told the cabinet, when pressing for the despatch of the fleets to the Bosphorus in July 1853, as a reply to Russia's occupation of the principalities. He believed the tsar had resolved upon 'the complete submission of Turkey,' and was 'bent upon a stand-up fight.' 'If he is determined to break a lance with us,' he wrote to Sidney Herbert, 21 Sept., 'why, then, have at him, say I, and perhaps he may have enough of it before we have done with him.' It is curious, however, that the special act which provoked the declaration of war—the sending of the allied fleets to take possession of the Black Sea—was ordered by the cabinet during the interval of Palmerston's resignation. When war had been declared, and the troops were at Varna, Palmerston laid a memorandum before the cabinet (14 June 1854) in which he argued that the mere driving of the Russians out of the principalities was not a sufficient reprisal, and that 'it seems absolutely necessary that some heavy blow should be struck at the naval power and territorial dimensions of Russia.' His proposals were the capture of Sevastopol, the occupation of the Crimea, and the expulsion of the Russians from Georgia and Circassia. His plan was adopted by the cabinet, and afterwards warmly supported by Gladstone (ASHLEY, *Life*, ii. 300). No one then foresaw the long delays, the blunders, the mismanagement, and the terrible hardships of the ensuing winter. When things looked blackest there was a feeling that Palmerston was the only man, and Lord John Russell proposed that the two offices of secretary for war and secretary at war should be united in Palmerston. On Aberdeen's rejection of this sensible proposal, Lord John resigned, 23 Jan. 1855, sooner than resist Roebuck's motion (28 Jan.) for a select committee of inquiry into the state of our army in the Crimea. After two nights' debate the government were defeated by a majority of 157, and resigned on 1 Feb. 1855.

On the fall of the Aberdeen ministry Lord Derby attempted to form a government, and invited Palmerston to take the leadership of the House of Commons, which Disraeli was willing to surrender to him. Finding, however, that none of the late cabinet would go with him, Palmerston declined, engaging at the same time to support any government that carried on the war with energy, and sustained the dignity and interests of the country abroad. When both Lord Derby

and Lord John Russell had failed to construct an administration, although Palmerston magnanimously consented to serve again under 'Johnny,' he was himself sent for by the queen, and, after some delay, succeeded (6 Feb. 1855) in forming a government of whigs and Peelites; the latter, however (Gladstone, Graham, and Sidney Herbert), retired within three weeks, on Palmerston's reluctant consent to the appointment of Roebuck's committee of inquiry into the management of the war. Their places were filled by Sir G. C. Lewis, Sir C. Wood, and Lord John Russell, and the cabinet thus gained in strength and unity—especially as Russell was fortunately absent at the Vienna conference.

The situation when Palmerston at last became prime minister of England, at the age of seventy, was full of danger and perplexity. The siege of Sevastopol seemed no nearer a conclusion; the alliance of the four powers was shaken; the emperor of the French had lost heart, and was falling more and more under the influence of financiers; the sultan of Turkey was squandering borrowed money on luxuries and showing himself unworthy of support; parties in England were broken up and disorganised, and the House of Commons was in a captious mood. At first Palmerston's old energy and address seem to have deserted him, but it was not long before his tact and temper began to reassert their power. He infused a new energy into the military departments, where his long experience as secretary at war served him in good stead. He united the secretaryships for and at war in one post, which he gave to Lord Panmure; he formed a special transport branch at the admiralty; sent out Sir John McNeill [q. v.] to reconstitute the commissariat at Balaclava, and despatched a strong sanitary commission with peremptory powers to overhaul the hospitals and camp. He remonstrated personally with Louis Napoleon upon his desire for peace at any price; and urged him (28 May 1855) 'not to allow diplomacy to rob us of the great and important advantages which we are on the point of gaining.' In a querulous House of Commons his splendid generalship carried him triumphantly through the session. The Manchester party he treated with contemptuous banter, and refused to 'count for anything'—the country was plainly against them; but he vigorously repulsed the attacks of the conservatives, and administered a severe rebuke (30 July) to Mr. Gladstone and the other Peelites who had in office gone willingly into the war, and then turned round and denounced it. The new energy

communicated to the army was rewarded by the fall of the south side of Sevastopol in September, and then once more Austria tried her hand at negotiations for peace. Palmerston firmly refused to consent to Buol's proposal to let the Black Sea question be the subject of a separate arrangement between Russia and Turkey—'I had better beforehand take the Chiltern Hundreds,' he said—but greatly as he and Clarendon would have preferred a third year's campaign, to complete the punishment of Russia, he found himself forced, by the action of the emperor of the French and the pressure of Austria, to agree to the treaty of Paris, 30 March 1856. The guarantee by the powers of the integrity and independence of the Turkish empire, the abnegation by them of any right to interfere between the sultan and his subjects, and the neutralisation of the Black Sea, with the cession of Bessarabia to Roumania and the destruction of the forts of Sevastopol, appeared to him a fairly satisfactory ending to the struggle. The Declaration of Paris, abolishing privateering and recognising neutral goods and bottoms, followed. The Garter was the expression of his sovereign's well-deserved approbation (12 July 1856).

Shortly after France had joined in guaranteeing the integrity of the Ottoman empire, she proposed to England, with splendid inconsistency, to partition the Turkish possessions in North Africa—England to have Egypt. While pointing out the moral impossibility of the scheme, Palmerston stated to Lord Clarendon his conviction that the only importance of Egypt to England consisted in keeping open the road to India. He opposed the project of the Suez Canal tooth and nail; the reasons he gave have for the most part been proved fallacious, but the real ground of his opposition was the fear that France might seize it in time of war and reduce Egypt to vassalage. He had little faith in the constancy of French friendship; 'in our alliance with France,' he wrote (to Clarendon, 29 Sept. 1857), 'we are riding a runaway horse, and must always be on our guard.' He predicted the risk of a Franco-Russian alliance; the necessity of a strong Germany headed by Prussia; and the advance of Russia to Bokhara, which led to the Persian seizure of Herat and the brief Persian war of the winter of 1856-7.

On 3 March 1857 the government was defeated by a majority of fourteen by a combination of conservatives, Peelites, liberals, and Irish, on Cobden's motion for a select committee to investigate the affair of the *lorcha Arrow* and the justification alleged

for the second China war. It had already been censured in the lords by a majority of thirty-six." A technical flaw in the registration of the Arrow gave a handle for argument to those who, ignorant of our position in China and regardless of a long series of breaches of treaty and of humiliations, insults, and outrages upon British subjects, saw merely an opportunity for making party capital or airing a vapid philanthropy which was seldom less appropriate. Palmerston might have sheltered himself behind the fact that the war had been begun by Sir John Bowring in the urgency of the moment, without consulting the home government; but he never deserted his officers in a just cause, and the case in dispute fitted closely with his own policy. His instructions to Sir John Davis, on 9 Jan. 1847, which were familiar to Bowring and Parkes, fully covered the emergency: 'We shall lose,' he wrote, 'all the vantage-ground we have gained by our victories in China if we take a low tone. . . . Depend upon it, that the best way of keeping any men quiet is to let them see that you are able and determined to repel force by force; and the Chinese are not in the least different, in this respect, from the rest of mankind' (*Parl. Papers*, 1847, 184, p. 2; LANE-POOLE, *Life of Sir Harry Parkes*, i. 216-37). No foreign secretary was so keenly alive to the importance of British interests in China, so thoroughly conversant with conditions of diplomacy in the Far East, or so firm in carrying out a wise and consistent policy. He accepted his parliamentary defeat very calmly, and, after finishing necessary business, appealed to the country. No man could feel the popular pulse more accurately, and the result of the general election was never doubtful. It was essentially a personal election, and the country voted for 'old Pam' with overwhelming enthusiasm. That 'fortuitous concourse of atoms,' the opposition, was scattered to the winds; Cobden, Bright, and Milner Gibson lost their seats, and the peace party was temporarily annihilated. In April the government returned to power with a largely increased majority (306 liberals, 287 conservatives).

Meanwhile the Indian mutiny had broken out. At first Palmerston, like most of the authorities, was disposed to underrate its seriousness, but his measures for the relief of the overmatched British garrison of India and the suppression of the rebellion were prompt and energetic. He sent out Sir Colin Campbell at once, and by the end of September eighty ships had sailed for India, carrying thirty thousand troops. Foreign

powers proffered assistance, but Palmerston replied that England must show that she was able to put down her own rebellions 'off her own bat' (ASHLEY, *l.c.* ii. 351). When this was accomplished, he brought in (12 Feb. 1858) the bill to transfer the dominions of the East India Company to the crown, and carried the first reading by a majority of 145. A week after this triumphant majority the government was beaten by nineteen on the second reading of the conspiracy to murder bill (by which, in view of Orsini's attempt on the life of Napoleon III, conspiracy to murder was to be made a felony). The division was a complete surprise, chiefly due to bad management of the whips. Palmerston at once resigned, and was succeeded by Lord Derby. The new ministry was in a minority, and, being beaten on a reform bill early in 1859, dissolved parliament. The election, however, left them still to the bad, and after Lord Derby had for the fourth time tried to induce the popular ex-premier to join him, he was defeated on 10 June, and resigned.

Embarrassed by the difficulty of choosing between the two veterans, Palmerston and Russell, the queen sent for Lord Granville, who found it impossible to form a cabinet, though Palmerston generously consented to join his junior. The country looked to 'Pam,' and him only, as its leader, and at the age of seventy-five he formed his second administration (30 June 1859), with a very strong cabinet, including Russell, Gladstone, Cornwall Lewis, Granville, Cardwell, Wood, Sidney Herbert, and Milner Gibson. His interval of leisure while out of office had enabled him to resume his old alliance with those who had opposed him on the Crimean and China wars. It was one of Palmerston's finest traits of character that he never bore malice. When Guizot was banished from France in 1848 Palmerston had him to dinner at once, old foe as he was, and they nearly 'shook their arms off' in their hearty reconciliation (GREVILLE, *Journal*, pt. ii. vol. iii. p. 157). 'He was always a very generous enemy,' said dying Cobden. When Granville supplanted Palmerston at the foreign office in 1851, he met with a cheery greeting and offers of help. When Russell threw him over, he called him laughingly 'a foolish fellow,' and bore him no personal grudge. So in 1859 he brought them all together again. His six remaining years were marked by peaceful tranquillity both in home and foreign affairs. Italy and France indeed presented problems of some complexity, but these were met with prudence and skill. Palmerston and his foreign minister, Lord John Russell, now

completely under his leader's influence, declined to mediate in the Franco-Austrian quarrel, as the conditions were unacceptable to Austria; but they did not conceal their disapproval of the preliminary treaty of Villafranca, which Palmerston declared drove Italy to despair and delivered her, tied hand and foot, into the power of Austria. 'L'Italie rendue à elle-même,' he said, had become 'l'Italie vendue à l'Autriche.' That he maintained strict neutrality in the later negotiations connected with the proposed congress of Zürich, and his suggested triple alliance of England, France, and Sardinia to prevent any forcible interference of foreign powers in the internal affairs of Italy (memorandum to cabinet, 5 Jan. 1860), is scarcely to be argued. The result of the mere rumour of such an alliance (which never came to pass) was the voluntary union of the Italian duchies to Sardinia and a long stride towards Italian unity. Palmerston resolutely refused to accede to the French desire that he should oppose Garibaldi, and hastened to recognise with entire satisfaction the new kingdom of Italy. An eloquent panegyric on the death of Cavour, delivered in the House of Commons on 6 June 1861, formed a worthy conclusion to the sympathy of many years.

Palmerston's vigilant care of the national defences was never relaxed, and the increase of the French navy and the hostile language towards England which was becoming more general in France strengthened him in his policy of fortifying the arsenals and dockyards at Portsmouth, Plymouth, Chatham, and Cork, for which he obtained a vote of nine millions in 1860. In his memorable speech on this occasion (23 July) he said: 'If your dockyards are destroyed, your navy is cut up by the roots. If any naval action were to take place . . . you would have no means of refitting your navy and sending it out to battle. If ever we lose the command of the sea, what becomes of this country?' In spite of a personal liking, from 1859, when he visited him at Compiègne, onwards he had grown more and more distrustful of Louis Napoleon, whose mind, he said, was 'as full of schemes as a warren is full of rabbits,' and whose aggrandising theory of a 'natural frontier,' involving the annexation of Nice and Savoy, and even of Chablais and Faucigny, neutral districts of Switzerland, had produced a very unfavourable impression. A threat of sending the English fleet was necessary to prevent Genoa being added to the spoils of the disinterested champion of Italy. The interference of France in the Druse difficulty of 1860 also caused some anxiety. Palmerston was convinced that

Louis Napoleon would yield to a national passion for paying off old scores against England, and he preached the strengthening of the army and navy and encouraged the new rifle volunteer movement. In this policy he was opposed by Gladstone, the chancellor of the exchequer, whose brilliant budgets contributed notably to the reputation of the government. There was little cordiality between the two men. 'He has never behaved to me as a colleague,' said Palmerston, and went on to prophesy that when Gladstone became prime minister 'we shall have strange doings.' On the chancellor of the exchequer's pronounced hostility to the scheme of fortifications, Palmerston wrote to the queen that it was 'better to lose Mr. Gladstone than to run the risk of losing Portsmouth.' With Lord John Russell's projects of electoral reform the prime minister was not in sympathy; but he quietly let his colleague introduce his bill, knowing very well that, in the total apathy of the country, it would die a natural death. It is significant of these differences and of the general confidence in Palmerston that for a temporary purpose, and in view of possible secessions from the cabinet, Disraeli promised the government the support of the conservative party. The 'consummate tact,' to use Greville's phrase, displayed by the premier in accommodating the dispute between the lords and commons over the paper bill, and the adoption of Cobden's commercial treaty with France, were among the events of the session of 1860, at the close of which Lord Westbury wrote to Palmerston to express his admiration of his 'masterly leading during this most difficult session.'

During the civil war in America Palmerston preserved strict neutrality of action, in spite of the pronounced sympathy of the English upper classes, and even it was believed of some of the cabinet, for the South, and the pressure in the same direction exerted by the emperor of the French. What friction there was with the North arose out of isolated cases for which the government had no responsibility. The forcible seizure of two confederate passengers on board the British mail-steamer Trent in November 1861 was an affront and a breach of the law of nations, especially inexcusable in a state which repudiated the 'right of search.' Palmerston's prompt despatch of the guards to Canada, even before receiving a reply to his protest, proved, as he prophesied, the shortest way to peace. Seward, the American secretary of state, at once submitted, and restored the prisoners. The Alabama

dispute went far nearer to a serious rupture, though the hesitation to detain the vessel at Birkenhead in August 1862 was due not to Palmerston or Russell, but to the law officers of the crown. Whatever the sympathies of England for the South, Palmerston actively stimulated the admiralty in its work of suppressing the slave trade.

In 1862 the Ionian Islands were presented to Greece, on Mr. Gladstone's recommendation, although Palmerston had formerly held the opinion that Corfu ought to be retained as an English military station. Apart from a fruitless attempt in 1863 to intercede again for the Poles, and a refusal to enter a European congress suggested by Louis Napoleon for the purpose of revising the treaties of 1815, and thereby opening, as Palmerston feared, a number of dangerous pretensions, the chief foreign question that occupied him during his concluding years was the Danish war. While condemning the king of Denmark's policy towards the Schleswig-Holstein duchies, he thought the action of Prussia and Austria ungenerous and dishonest; but the conference he managed to assemble for the settlement of the dispute broke up when it appeared that neither party could be induced to yield a point; and, in presence of a lukewarm cabinet and the indifference of France and Russia, Palmerston could do little for the weaker side. Challenged by Disraeli on his Danish policy, the premier, then eighty years of age, defended himself with his old vigour, and then turning to the general, and especially the financial, work of the government, 'played to the score' by citing the growing prosperity of the country under his administration, with the result that he secured a majority of eighteen. His last important speech in the house was on Irish affairs, on which, as a liberal and active Irish landholder, he had a right to his opinions. He did not believe that legislative remedies or tenant-right could keep the people from emigrating: 'nothing can do it except the influence of capital.'

For several years before his death Lord Palmerston had been a martyr to gout, which he did not improve by his assiduous attendance at the House of Commons. There, if he seldom made set speeches (his sight had become too weak to read his notes), his ready interposition, unflinching tact and good humour, practical management, and wide popularity on both sides, smoothed away difficulties, kept up a dignified tone, and expedited the business of the house. He refused to give in to old age, kept up his shooting, rode to Harrow and back in the rain when nearly

seventy-seven to lay the foundation-stone of the school library, and on his eightieth birthday was on horseback nearly all day inspecting forts at Anglesey, Gosport, and elsewhere. When parliament, having sat for over six years, was dissolved, 6 July 1865, he went down to his constituency and won a contested election. But he never met the argument, for a chill caught when driving on.

at sh first a half-an-hour harness. He had not been a member of every cabinet except Peel's and Derby's, from 1834 to 1865, and had held office for all but a short tury. He was buried on 27 Oct. with public honours in Westminster Abbey, where he lies near Pitt. Lady Palmerston was laid beside him on her death on 11 Sept. 1869, at the age of eighty-two.

Among the honours conferred upon him, besides the Garter, may be mentioned the grand cross of the Bath (1832), the lordwardenship of the Cinque ports (1861), lordrectorship of Glasgow University (1863), and honorary degrees of D.C.L., Oxford (1862), and of LL.D., Cambridge (1864). His title died with him, and his property descended to Lady Palmerston's second son by her first marriage, William Francis Cowper, who added the name of Temple, and was created Baron Mount Temple of Sligo in 1880; and thence devolved to her grandson, the Right Hon. Evelyn Ashley.

Lord Palmerston, as Mr. Ashley points out (ii. 458-9), was a great man rather by a combination of good qualities, paradoxically contrary, than by any special attribute of genius. 'He had great pluck, combined with remarkable tact; unflinching good temper, associated with firmness almost amounting to obstinacy. He was a strict disciplinarian, and yet ready above most men to make allowance for the weakness and shortcomings of others. He loved hard work in all its details, and yet took a keen delight in many kinds of sport and amusement. He believed in England as the best and greatest country in the world . . . but knew and cared more about foreign nations than any other public man. He had little or no vanity, and claimed but a modest value for his own abilities; yet no man had a better opinion of his own judgment or was more full of self-confidence.' He never doubted for an instant, when he had once made up his mind on a subject, that he was right and those who differed from him were hopelessly

wrong. The result was a firmness of tenacity of purpose which brought through many difficulties. He said himself, 'A man of energy may make a wrong decision, but, like a strong horse that carries you rashly into a quagmire, he brings you by his sturdiness out on the other side.' M. Drouyn de Lhuys used the same simile when speaking of Palmerston's 'sagacity, courage, trustworthiness' as a 'daring pilot in extremity.' Lord Shaftesbury, the man whom Palmerston loved and esteemed above all others, wrote of him, 'I admired, every day more, his patriotism, his simplicity of purpose, his indefatigable spirit, his unflinching good humour, his kindness of heart, his prompt, tender, and active consideration for others in the midst of his heaviest toils and anxieties.' His buoyant, vivacious, optimistic nature produced an erroneous impression of levity, but this very lightness of heart carried him unscathed through many a dark crisis, and kept up the spirit of the nation, whose faults and whose virtues he so completely represented. A thorough English gentleman, simple, manly, and detesting display and insincerity, he brought into private life the same generous, kindly, happy spirit which he showed in his public career. An excellent landlord, he spent infinite pains and money over his Irish and English estates, and did his best to extirpate the middleman. He took a keen interest in all local amusements, sports, and meetings, and showed a real and genial sympathy with the welfare of farmers, labourers, and working men. A keen sportsman, he preserved game, hunted when he could, rode daily on his old grey, familiar to all Londoners, and made exercise, as he said, 'a religion.' He bred and trained horses since 1815, but seldom betted. His green and orange colours were especially well known at the smaller provincial race meetings. But he won the Cesarewitch with Ilione in 1841, and the Ascot Stakes with Buckthorn in 1852, and his Mainstone ran third favourite for the Derby in 1860, but was believed to have been 'got at.' In 1845 he was elected an honorary member of the Jockey Club. Indoors he had a genius for 'fluking' at his favourite game at billiards; his opponents said it was typical of his statesmanship. He was no student, and, though he could quote Horace and Virgil and the English classics, he only once refers to a book in his published correspondence—and that was 'Coningsby.' His conversation was agreeable but not striking; but, as Greville acutely observed, 'when he takes his pen in his hand, his intellect seems to have full play.' His despatches are clear, bold, trenchant, logical; there he spoke his mind with un-

sparing lucidity and frank bluntness. His letters, always written in a hurry, are simple, clear, honest, and humorous, and show a skilful delicacy both in reproof and praise. As a speaker, he had the great art of gauging the temper of his hearers and suiting his speech to their mood. He was ready in debate, and his set speeches, which were carefully prepared, carried his audience with him, although they were neither brilliant nor philosophical, and he often resorted to somewhat flippant jokes and fustian rhetoric to help out an embarrassing brief. But what gave him his supreme influence with his countrymen in his later life, as orator, statesman, and leader, was his courage and confidence.

The chief portraits of Palmerston are: (1) æt. 15 or 16, by Heaphy at Broadlands, in the possession of the Right Hon. E. Ashley; (2) æt. circa 45, by Partridge, in the National Portrait Gallery; (3) æt. 51, a sketch by Hayter, for his picture of the reformed House of Commons, at Broadlands; (4) æt. 66, a full-length by Partridge, presented to Lady Palmerston by members of the House of Commons in 1850, at Broadlands; (5) æt. 71, a large equestrian portrait, on the favourite grey, by Barraud, at Broadlands; (6) æt. 80, a remarkable sketch by Cruikshank, at Broadlands. Statues of him stand in Westminster Abbey (by Robert Jackson), Palace Yard (by Thomas Woolner, R.A.), and at Romsey market-place (by Matthew Noble). A bust by Noble and a portrait in oils by G. Lowes Dickenson are in the hall of the Reform Club. From 6 Dec. 1851, when (Sir) John Tenniel's cartoon of Palmerston in the character of the 'Judicious Bottle-Holder, or the Downing Street Pet' appeared in 'Punch,' Palmerston was constantly represented in that periodical; a straw was invariably placed between the statesman's lips in allusion to his love of horses (SPIELMANN, *History of Punch*, pp. 203-4).

[The Life of Lord Palmerston up to 1847 was written by his faithful adherent, Lord Dalling (Sir H. Lytton Bulwer), vols. i. and ii. 1870, vol. iii. edited and partly written by the Hon. Evelyn Ashley, 1874, after the author's death. Mr. Ashley completed the biography in two more vols. 1876. The whole work was reissued in a revised and slightly abridged form by Mr. Ashley in 2 vols. 1879, with the title 'The Life and Correspondence of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston;' the letters are judiciously curtailed, but unfortunately without indicating where the excisions occur; the appendices of the original work are omitted, but much fresh matter is added, and this edition is undoubtedly the standard biography, and has been freely used and quoted above. Palmerston wrote a brief and

not quite accurate autobiography up to 1860 for the information of Lady Cowper, afterwards his wife, which is printed in full at the end of Lord Dalling's first volume, and is freely used in Mr. Ashley's revised edition. He also kept a journal from June 1806 to February 1808, extracts from which are printed in Mr. Ashley's first volume (1879), pp. 17 to 41. The best short biography is Mr. Lloyd C. Sanders's 'Life of Viscount Palmerston,' 1888, which has furnished useful data for the present article. The Marquis of Lorne has also published a short biography, containing much previously unpublished material. Anthony Trollope's 'Lord Palmerston,' 1882, is an enthusiastic eulogy, chiefly remarkable for a vigorous defence of Palmerston against the criticisms of the Prince Consort, but containing nothing new. A. Laugel in 'Lord Palmerston et Lord Russell,' 1877, gives a French depreciation of 'un grand ennemi de la France.' Selections from his speeches were published, with a brief memoir by G. H. Francis, in 1852, with the title 'Opinions and Policy of Viscount Palmerston.' Almost all the contemporary political and diplomatic memoirs and histories supply information or criticism on Palmerston's policy and acts. Of these the most important is Greville's Journal, though its tone of personal malevolence detracts from the value of its evidence. 'Palmerston's Borough,' by F. J. Snell (1894), contains notes on the Tiverton elections. Other sources for this article are Fagan's History of the Reform Club; Parliamentary Papers; Return of Members of Parliament, 1878; Complete Peerage by G. E. Cokayne; information from the Right Hon. Evelyn Ashley; B. P. Lascelles of Harrow; J. Bass Mullinger, librarian, and R. F. Scott, bursar, of St. John's College, Cambridge, and J. W. Clark, registry of that university.] S. L.-P.

TEMPLE, JAMES (*d.* 1640-1668), regicide, was the only son of Sir Alexander Temple of Etchingham in Sussex by his first wife, Mary, daughter of John Somers and widow of Thomas Peniston. Sir Alexander (*d.* 1629) was younger brother of Sir Thomas Temple, first bart., of Stowe (*d.* 1625), and of Sir John Temple, knt., ancestor of the Temples of Frampton in Warwickshire. He was knighted at the Tower on 14 March 1604, and represented the county of Sussex in the parliament of 1625-6. His second wife was Mary, daughter of John Reve of Bury St. Edmunds, and widow of Robert Barkworth of London, and of John Busbridge of Etchingham in Sussex.

James was captain of a troop of horse in the parliamentary army in 1642, serving under William Russell, earl of Bedford. In 1643 he was made captain of the fort of West Tilbury, a post which his father had held before him (*cf.* *Commons' Journals*, iii. 202, 205, 242, 284). He was appointed one of the commissioners for the sequestration

of the estates of delinquents for the county of Sussex in 1643. In December 1643 he defended the fort of Bramber, of which he was governor, against an attack by the royalists. In February 1644-5 he was made one of the commissioners for the county of Sussex for raising supplies for the Scottish army. In September 1645 he was elected a 'recruiter' to the Long parliament, representing the borough of Bramber, and in May 1649 he was made governor of Tilbury fort.

Temple was one of the king's judges, and attended nine sittings of the trial. He was present on the morning of 27 Jan. 1649 when sentence was passed, and signed the warrant on 29 Jan.

On 9 May 1650 he was added to the militia commission for the county of Kent, and in September of the same year was replaced in his post of governor of Tilbury fort by Colonel George Crompton. In 1653 Temple's pecuniary difficulties led to a temporary imprisonment. He sat as a recruiter in the restored Rump of 1659, and was granted a residence in Whitehall in the same year.

At the Restoration Temple was excepted from the act of oblivion on 9 June 1660, and attempted to make his way into Ireland. He was, however, taken prisoner at Coventry, where he 'confessed that he was a parliament man and one of the late king's judges,' and was detained in the custody of the sheriff of Coventry. He surrendered himself on 16 June in accordance with the king's proclamation of 4 June, and was received into the custody of the lieutenant of the Tower. He was excepted out of the indemnity bill of 29 Aug. with the saving clause of suspension of execution until determined upon by act of parliament. On 10 Oct. he was indicted at the sessions house, Old Bailey, when he pleaded 'not guilty.' On 16 Oct., when again called, he begged to see his signature on the warrant, adding 'If it be my hand I must confess all, the circumstances must follow.' Acknowledging the hand to be his, he presented a petition to the court. He was pronounced 'guilty,' when he begged for the benefit of the king's proclamation. In his petition he stated that before 1648 he came under the influence of Dr. Stephen Goffe [q.v.] and Dr. Henry Hammond [q.v.], who 'came to him as from the said late king,' urging him to take part in the trial for the purpose of providing them with information as to the probable result. Accordingly he furnished them with an account from time to time. He was afterwards suspected by Cromwell of concealing royalist papers and fell out of favour,

losing the command of his fort at Tilbury and all his arrears. He produced certificates from various friends of the late king as to his constant willingness to serve them and preserve to them their liberties and estates.

Temple was not executed, but remained in confinement in the Tower for some years, and was in the Old Castle in Jersey in 1668. It is not known where or when he died. By his wife Mary he had five sons and at least one daughter, Mary.

Chillingworth (CHEYNELL, *Chillingworthi Novissima*) speaks of Temple as 'a man that hath his head full of stratagems, his heart full of piety and valour, and his hand as full of success as it is of dexterity.' On the other hand, Winstanley (*Loyal Martyrology*, p. 141) pronounces him 'not so much famous for his valour as his villainy, being remarkable for nothing but this horrible business of the king's murder, for which he came into the pack to have a share in the spoyle.'

Letters from Temple to Sir Thomas Barrington on military matters, written in July and August 1643, have been printed by the historical manuscripts commission (App. 7th Rep. pp. 554, 461).

[Nichols's Leicestershire, iv. 960; Lipscomb's Buckinghamshire, iii. 35; Berry's County Genealogies (Sussex); Metcalfe's Book of Knights, p. 152; Official Return of M.P.s, i. 472, 494; Cal. State Papers, Dom. 1623-60 passim; Nalson's Trial of Charles I.; Peacock's Army Lists, p. 50; Masson's Milton, ii. 445, v. 454, vi. 43; Trial of the Regicides, pp. 29, 266-7, 271, 276; Hist. MSS. Comm. 7th Rep. pp. 101, 155-6; Sussex Archaeological Society's Coll. v. 54, 56, 58, 154; Commons' Journals, v. 572, vi. 238, viii. 65, 139; Lords' Journals, vii. 226, xi. 52, 66; Cal. of Comm. for Comp. pp. 1245, 2370-1; Konnett's Reg. pp. 179, 238; Addit. MS. 6356, f. 45 (par. reg. of Etchingham).] B. P.

TEMPLE, SIR JOHN (1600-1677), master of the rolls in Ireland, eldest son of Sir William Temple (1555-1627) [q. v.], provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and Martha, daughter of Robert Harrison of Derbyshire, was born in Ireland in 1600. After receiving his education at Trinity College, Dublin, he spent some time travelling abroad, and on his return entered the personal service of Charles I. He obtained livery of his inheritance on 5 Jan. 1628, and was shortly afterwards knighted. Returning to Ireland, he was on 31 Jan. 1640 created master of the rolls there (patent 20 Feb.) in succession to Sir Christopher Wandesford [q. v.] (SMYTH, *Law Officers of Ireland*, p. 67) and admitted a privy councillor. When the rebellion broke out in October 1641 he was of the greatest service to govern-

ment in provisioning the city (CARTE, *Life of Ormond*, i. 171). On 28 July 1642 he was returned M.P. for co. Meath, being described as of Ballycrath, co. Carlow (*Official Return of M.P.s*, Ireland, pt. ii. p. 627). In the struggle between the crown and the parliament his inclinations drew him to the side of the latter, and, in consequence of the vehement resistance he offered to the cessation, he was in August 1643 suspended from his office by the lords justices Borlase and Tichborne, acting on instructions from Charles, and, with Sir W. Parsons, Sir A. Loftus, and Sir R. Meredith, committed a close prisoner to the castle. He was specially charged with having in May and June written two scandalous letters against the king, which had been used to asperse his majesty as favouring the rebels (CARTE, *Life of Ormond*, i. 441-443). His imprisonment lasted nearly a year, when he was exchanged. In compensation for what was regarded as his harsh treatment, he was provided in 1646 with a seat in the English House of Commons as a 'recruiter' for Chichester, receiving at the same time its special thanks for the services he had rendered to the English interest in Ireland at the beginning of the rebellion.

That year Temple published his 'Irish Rebellion; or an history of the beginning and first progresse of the generall rebellion raised within the kingdom of Ireland upon the . . . 23 Oct. 1641. Together with the barbarous cruelties and bloody massacres which ensued thereupon,' in 2 pts. 4to. The book made an immediate and great sensation. As the production of a professed eye-witness and of one whose position entitled him to speak with authority, its statements were received with unquestioning confidence, and did much to inflame popular indignation in England against the Irish, and to justify the severe treatment afterwards measured out to them by Cromwell. But the calmer judgment of posterity has seen reason to doubt the veracity of many of its statements, and, though still occasionally appealed to as an authority, its position is rather that of a partisan pamphlet than of an historical treatise (LECKY, *Hist. of Engl.* ii. 148-150; HICKSON, *Irish Massacres*, vol. i. introd. p. 140). A new edition appeared in London in 1674, much to the annoyance of government, but, on being questioned by the lieutenant (the Earl of Essex) on the subject, Temple disclaimed having had any share in its reissue, saying that 'whoever printed it did it without his knowledge' (ESSEX, *Letters*, p. 2). So highly, indeed, were the Irish incensed against it that one of the first resolutions of the parliament of 1689 was to

order it to be burnt by the common hangman (*Egerton MS.* 917, f. 108); but since then it has been frequently reprinted both in Dublin and in London.

In 1647, after the conclusion of the peace between Ormonde and the parliament, Temple was appointed a commissioner for the government of Munster, and on 16 Oct. the following year was made joint commissioner with Sir W. Parsons for the administration of the great seal of Ireland. But, having voted with the majority on 5 Dec. in favour of the proposed compromise with Charles, he was excluded from further attendance in the house; and during the next four years he took no part in public affairs, residing the while quietly in London. His personal experience, however, of the circumstances attending the outbreak of the rebellion led to his appointment on 21 Nov. 1653 as a commissioner 'to consider and advise from time to time how the titles of the Irish and others to any estate in Ireland, and likewise their delinquency according to their respective qualifications, might be put in the most speedy and exact way of adjudication consistent with justice.' His labours accomplished, he returned to England in the following year, and, the government of Ireland having grown into a settled condition, he expressed his willingness to resume the regular execution of his old office of master of the rolls. He accordingly repaired thither in June 1655, bearing a highly recommendatory letter from Cromwell to the lord-deputy Fleetwood and council of state in his favour (*Commonwealth Papers*, P.R.O. Dublin, A/28, 26, f. 60). In addition to an increased official salary he received from time to time several grants of money for special services rendered by him. In September that year he was joined with Sir R. King, Benjamin Worsley, and others in a commission for letting and setting of houses and lands belonging to the state in the counties of Dublin, Kildare, and Carlow, and on 13 June 1650 was appointed a commissioner for determining all differences among the adventurers concerning lands, &c. (*ib.* A/ 26, 24, ff. 115, 227). As a recompense for his services he received on 6 July 1658 a grant of two leases for twenty-one years, the one comprising the town and lands of Moyle, Castle-town, Park, &c., adjoining the town of Carlow, amounting to about 1,490 acres, in part afterwards confirmed to him under the act of settlement on 18 June 1666; the other of certain lands in the barony of Balrothery West, co. Dublin, to which were added those of Lisboble in the same county on 30 March 1659 for a similar term of years. He ob-

tained license to go to England for a whole year or more on 21 April 1659 (*SMYTH, Law Officers*, p. 67). At the Restoration he was confirmed in his office of master of the rolls, sworn a member of the privy council, appointed a trustee for the '49 officers, and on 4 May 1661 elected, with his eldest son William, to represent co. Carlow in parliament (*Official Return of M.P.s, Ireland*, pt. ii. p. 607). On the 6th of the same month he obtained for the payment of a fine of 540*l.* a reversionary lease from the queen mother Henrietta Maria of the park of Blandesby or Blansby in Yorkshire for a term of forty years. He received a confirmation in perpetuity of his lands in co. Dublin, including those of Palmerstown, under the act of settlement on 29 July 1666; to which were added on 20 May 1669 others in counties Kilkenny, Meath, Westmeath, and Dublin. Other grants followed, viz. on 3 May 1672 of 144 acres formerly belonging to the Phoenix Park, and on 10 Nov. 1676 of certain lands, fishings, &c., in and near Chapelizod. He was appointed vice-treasurer of Ireland in 1673, but died in 1677, and was buried beside his father in Trinity College near the campanile, having that year made a benefaction of 100*l.* to the college to be laid out in certain buildings, entitling him and his heirs to bestow two handsome chambers upon such students as they desired.

By his wife Mary, daughter of Dr. John Hammond [q. v.], of Chertsey, Surrey, who died at Penshurst in Kent in November 1638, Temple had, besides two sons and a daughter who died young, Sir William, the statesman (1628-1699), noticed separately; Sir John (see below); Martha [see under TEMPLE, SIR WILLIAM, 1628-1699]; and Mary, who married (1) Abraham Yarner, and (2), on 19 Dec. 1693, Hugh Eccles.

SIR JOHN TEMPLE (1632-1704), having received an education in England qualifying him for the bar, was on 10 July 1660 created solicitor-general of Ireland (patent, 1 Feb. 1661; *SMYTH, Law Officers*, p. 177), and in March following appointed a commissioner for executing the king's 'Declaration' of 30 Nov. 1660 touching the settlement of the country. He was returned M.P. for Carlow borough on 8 May 1661, and was elected speaker on the first day (6 Sept.) of the second sessions of parliament in the place of Sir A. Mervyn (cf. CARTE, *Life of Ormonde*, App. pp. 20-1), being shortly afterwards knighted. His reputation as a lawyer stood very high, and there was some talk in October 1679 of making him attorney-general of England (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 7th Rep. pt. i. p. 476). He was continued in his office of solicitor-

general by James II till the violent measures of Tyrconnel compelled him to seek refuge in England [see TALBOT, RICHARD]. His name was included in the list of persons proscribed by the Irish parliament in 1689, and his estates to the value of 1,700*l.* per annum sequestered. But after the revolution he was on 30 Oct. 1690 (patent, 21 March 1691) appointed attorney-general of Ireland in the place of Sir Richard Nagle [q. v.], removed, and continued in that office till his resignation on 10 May 1695. Afterwards retiring to his estate at East Sheen in Surrey, he died there on 10 March 1704, and was buried in Mortlake church. By his wife Jane, daughter of Sir Abraham Yarnor, of Dublin, whom he married on 4 Aug. 1663, he had several children, of whom his eldest surviving son Henry (1673?-1757) [q. v.], was created Viscount Palmerston.

[Lodge's Peerage, ed. Archdall, v. 235-42; Allibone's Dict. of Authors; Webb's Compendium of Irish Biography; Gilbert's Contemporary Hist. of Affairs; Clarendon State Papers, ii. 134, and authorities quoted.] R. D.

TEMPLE, PETER (1600-1663), regicide, was third son of Edmund Temple (*d.* 1616) of Temple Hall in the parish of Sibbesdon, near Whellesburgh in Leicestershire, and of his wife Elizabeth, daughter of Robert Burgoine of Wroxhall in Warwickshire. Peter, who was born in 1600, was apprenticed to a wendraper in Friday Street, London, but, his elder brothers Paul and Jonathan dying, he inherited the family estate of Temple he *ll.*

Had December 1642, when the association

for the mutual defence and safety of the for ties of Leicester, Derby, Nottingham, counnd, Northampton, Buckingham, Bedford, Huntingdon was formed, Temple ford, rosen one of the committee. He was was el time the captain of a troop of horse. at that an original member of the committee He was management of the militia for the for theof Leicester, formed on 17 Jan. 1643. county an. 1644 he was elected high sheriff On 19 estershire (having been appointed to of Leicdy by the parliament on 30 Dec. pre- the post and was deputed to settle the diffe- viously), between Lord Grey and Richard rences Mayor of Leicester. He was placed Ludlam, mmittee for raising supplies for the on the once of the Scottish army in the maintand county of Leicester, when it was towed in February 1645. His bravery as a forrier has been doubted, and he has been so- used of attempting to dissuade Lord Grey som fortifying Leicester and of retiring with his troops to Rockingham on the intelligence of the enemy's advance on the town in May

1645. Even his supporters were unable to advance an adequate reason for his departure for London just before the siege of Leicester (29 May 1645). On 17 Nov. 1645 he was chosen a freeman of the town of Leicester, and elected to represent the borough in parliament, vice Thomas Cooke, disabled to sit on 30 Sept. previously. At about the same time he was military governor of Cole Orton in Leicestershire.

Temple was one of the king's judges. He attended all the sittings of the court save two, was present on 27 Jan. 1648 when sentence was passed, and signed the death warrant on the 29th. On 13 June 1649 he was added to the committee for compounding at Goldsmiths' Hall, and was elected to serve on a sub-committee of the same on 23 June. On 21 July he was petitioning parliament for redress for losses during the war, and was voted 1,500*l.* out of the sequestrations in the county of Leicester. By 3 Jan. 1650 1,200*l.* had been paid, and further payment was ordered out of the Michaelmas rents. In December 1650, being then in London, Temple was ordered by the council of state to return to his duties as militia commissioner for the county of Leicester. In July 1659 he was again in London, and was assigned lodgings in Whitehall.

At the Restoration Temple was excepted from the act of oblivion. He surrendered himself on 12 June, in accordance with the king's proclamation of 4 June 1660, and was committed to the Tower. He was excepted from the indemnity bill of 29 Aug. with the saving clause of suspension of execution awaiting special act of parliament. He pleaded 'not guilty' when brought to the bar of the sessions house, Old Bailey, on 10 Oct., and when tried on the 16th was condemned to be hanged. Temple then pleaded the benefit of the king's proclamation. He was respited, and remained in the Tower till 20 Dec. 1663, when he died a prisoner. His estate of Temple Hall was confiscated by Charles II, who bestowed it on his brother James, duke of York. It had been in the possession of the Temples for many generations.

Temple married Phoebe, daughter of John Gayring of London, by whom he had three sons, Edmund, John, and Peter (*b.* 1635). Winstanley (*Loyal Martyrology*, pp. 141-2) gives a poor character of Temple, as one 'easier to be led to act anything to which the hope of profit called him,' and considers him to have been 'fooled by Oliver into the snare.'

The subject of this article has been confused alike with Sir Peter Temple, the con-

temporary baronet of Stowe [see TEMPLE, SIR RICHARD, 1634-1697], and with Sir Peter Temple of Stanton Bury, knt., nephew of the baronet.

[Nichols's *Herald and Genealogist*, iii. 389-391; Nolle's *Spanish Armada*; *Official Lists of Members of Parliament*, i. 490; Noble's *Lives of the Regicides*; Masson's *Milton*, iii. 402, vi. 43, 54, 93, 115; Nichols's *Leicestershire*, i. 461, iii. Apr. 4, 33, iv. 959; *Commons' Journals*, iii. 354, 576, 638, vi. 267, viii. 61, 63; Nulson's *Trial of Charles I*; *Calendar of Committee for Compounding*, pp. 144, 165; *Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1650 p. 468, 1659-60 pp. 30, 96, 325, 1663 p. 383; Thompson's *Leicester*, pp. 377, 381, 386; *Trial of the Regicides*, pp. 29, 267, 271, 276; Innes's *An Examination of a Printed Pamphlet entitled A Narrative of the Siege of the Town of Leicester*, p. 5; *An Examination Examined*, p. 13.] B. P.

TEMPLE, SIR RICHARD (1634-1697), politician, born on 28 March 1634, was the son of Sir Peter Temple, second baronet of Stowe, by his second wife, Christian, daughter and coheir of Sir John Leveson of Walling in Kent (*Parish Register of Kensington*, Harl. Soc. p. 70).

Although in the visitation of Leicestershire in 1619 the family of Temple is traced back to the reign of Henry III, the first undoubted figure in their pedigree is Robert Temple, who lived at Temple Hall in Leicestershire in the middle of the fifteenth century. He left three sons, of whom Robert carried on the elder line at Temple Hall, to which belonged Peter Temple [q.v.] the 'regicide,' while Thomas settled at Witney in Oxfordshire. Thomas Temple's great-grandson Peter became lessee of Stowe in Buckinghamshire, and died on 28 May 1577. He had two sons—John, who purchased Stowe on 27 Jan. 1589-90, and Anthony, father of Sir William Temple (1555-1627) [q.v.]. John was succeeded by his eldest son Thomas, who was knighted in June 1603 and created a baronet on 24 Sept. 1611. He married Hester, daughter of Miles Sandys of Latimer, Buckinghamshire, by whom he had four sons. Of these the eldest was Sir Peter Temple, father of Sir Richard (NICHOLS, *Hist. of Leicestershire*, iv. 958-62; HANNAY, *Three Hundred Years of a Norman House*, 1867, pp. 262-88; *Herald and Genealogist*, 1st ser. iii. 385-97; *Notes and Queries*, III. viii. 506).

SIR PETER TEMPLE (1592-1653), who was baptised at Stowe on 10 Oct. 1592, represented the borough of Buckingham in the last two parliaments of Charles I, and was knighted at Whitehall on 6 June 1641 (METCALFE, *Book of Knights*, p. 196; *Official Returns of Mem-*

bers of Parliament, i. 480, 485). He espoused the cause of the parliamentarians, and held the commission of colonel in their army. But on the execution of Charles he threw up his commission, and exhibited so much disgust that information was laid against him in parliament for seditious language (*Journals of the House of Commons*, vii. 76, 79, 108). He died in 1653, and was buried at Stowe (*Stowe MSS.* 1077-9).

In 1654 Sir Richard Temple, although not of age, was chosen to represent Warwickshire in Cromwell's first parliament, and on 7 Jan. 1658-9 he was returned for the town of Buckingham under Richard Cromwell. At that time he was a secret royalist, and delayed the proceedings of parliament by proposing that the Scottish and Irish members should withdraw while the constitution and powers of the upper house were under discussion (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 5th Rep. pp. 171-2, 7th Rep. p. 483; LINGARD, *Hist. of England*, 1849, viii. 566). After the Restoration he was again returned for Buckingham, and retained his seat for the rest of his life, except in the parliament which met in March 1678-9, when he was defeated by the influence of the Duke of Buckingham (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 13th Rep. vi. 13, 20). On 19 April 1661 he was created a knight of the Bath. He became a prominent member of the country party, and in 1663 the king complained of his conduct to the House of Commons, who succeeded in effecting an accommodation (*Journals of the House of Commons*, viii. 502, 503, 507, 511-515; *Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1663-4, p. 190; PEPYS, *Diary*, ed. Braybrooke, pp. 175, 179, 182, 185). In 1671 a warrant was made out appointing him to the council for foreign plantations, and in the following year he was nominated senior commissioner of customs (*ib.* 1671 *passim*; HAYDN, *Book of Dignities*, pp. 273-4; *Hist. MSS. Comm.* 9th Rep. ii. 33). He distinguished himself by his zeal against those accused of participation in the popish plot, and on account of his anxiety to promote the exclusion bill was known to the adherents of the Duke of York as the 'Stoe monster.' In February 1682-3 Charles removed him from his place in the customs. He was reinstated in the following year, but was immediately dismissed on the accession of James II (LUTTRELL, *Brief Relation*, 1857, i. 251, 329). After the Revolution he regained his post on 5 April 1689, and held it until the place bill of 1694 compelled him to choose between his office and his seat in parliament (*ib.* i. 523, iii. 300, 353; *Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1689-90, pp. 53, 514, 516).

Temple was a prominent figure in the lower house in William's reign. In 1691 he was the foremost to assure the king of the resolution of the commons to support him in the war with France, and in the following year he opposed the triennial bill; his speech is preserved among the manuscripts of the Earl of Egmont (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 7th Rep. pp. 204-5, 207, 245). He died in 1697, and was buried at Stowe on 15 May.

By his wife Mary, daughter of Henry Knapp of Rawlins, Oxfordshire, he had four sons: Richard [see TEMPLE, SIR RICHARD, VISCOUNT COBHAM], Purbeck, Henry, and Arthur, who all died without issue. By her he had also six daughters, of whom Hester married Richard Grenville of Wootton, Buckinghamshire, ancestor of the dukes of Buckingham and Chandos. She was created Countess Temple in her own right on 18 Oct. 1749, and died at Bath on 6 Oct. 1752.

Temple was the author of: 1. 'An Essay on Taxes,' London, 1693, 4to, in which he opposed the land tax, and also the project of an excise on home commodities. 2. 'Some short Remarks upon Mr. Lock's Book, in answer to Mr. Launds [i.e. William Lowndes, q. v.], and several other books and pamphlets concerning Coin,' London, 1696, 4to, in which he attacked the new coinage. The latter pamphlet called forth an anonymous answer entitled 'Decus and Tutamen; or our New Money as now coined, in Full Weight and Fineness, proved to be for the Honour, Safety, and Advantage of England,' London, 1696, 8vo.

A folio volume containing collections from Temple's parliamentary papers, and another in his handwriting containing 'An Answer to a Book entitled the Case Stated of the Jurisdiction of the House of Lords on the Point of Impositions,' were formerly among the Earl of Ashburnham's manuscripts, and are now in the Stowe collection in the British Museum.

[Gibbs's Worthies of Buckinghamshire, p. 377; Collins's Peerage of England, ed. Brydges, ii. 413; Prime's Account of the Temple Family, New York, 3rd ed. 1896; Clarendon's Life, 1857, ii. 321; Stowe MSS.; Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 28054, f. 186; Cal. State Papers, Dom. 1689-90, pp. 53, 514, 516.] E. I. C.

TEMPLE, SIR RICHARD, VISCOUNT COBHAM (1669?-1749), born about 1669, was the eldest son of Sir Richard Temple (1634-1697) [q. v.], by his wife Mary, daughter of Henry Knapp of Rawlins, Oxfordshire. He received an ensigncy in Prince George's regiment of foot on 30 June 1685, and was appointed adjutant on 12 April 1687. On

11 July 1689 he obtained a captaincy in Babington's regiment of foot. In May 1697 he succeeded his father in the baronetcy and family estates, and on 17 Dec. he was returned to parliament for the town of Buckingham, his father's constituency, and retained it throughout William's reign. At the time of the general election for Anne's first parliament he was absent from the kingdom, and later was defeated in his candidature for Aylesbury, but was elected for the county on 8 Nov. 1704 by a majority of two votes. He sat for Buckinghamshire in the parliament of 1705, and for the town of Buckingham in those of 1708 and 1710 (*Official Returns of Members of Parliament*, i. 570, 579, 586, 593, 600, ii. 1, 9, 18; LUTTRELL, *Brief Relation*, 1857, v. 250, 486).

On 10 Feb. 1701-2 he was appointed colonel of one of the new regiments raised for the war with France, and was stationed in Ireland (*ib.* v. 140, 201, 214). He was afterwards transferred to the Netherlands, and served under Marlborough throughout his campaigns. He particularly distinguished himself at the siege of Lille in 1708, and was rewarded by being despatched to Lord Sunderland with the news of the capitulation (*Marlborough Despatches*, ed. Murray, 1845, i. 224, 542, ii. 530, iv. 274). On 1 Jan. 1705-6 he attained the rank of brigadier-general; on 1 Jan. 1708-9 he was promoted to that of major-general; he was created lieutenant-general on 1 Jan. 1709-10, and in the same year he received the colonelcy of the 4th dragoons (LUTTRELL, vi. 548, 686). Sir Richard's military career was interrupted by his political principles. Like his father, he was a staunch whig, and in consequence he was not included in the list of officers nominated to serve in Flanders under the Duke of Ormonde. In 1713 his regiment was given to Lieutenant-general William Evans.

On the accession of George I Temple was at once taken into favour. On 19 Oct. 1714 he was created Baron Cobham of Cobham in Kent, being descended through his grandmother, Christian Leveson, from William Brooke, tenth lord Cobham (1527-1597). He was sent as envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the emperor Charles VI to announce the accession of the new king. After his return he was made colonel of the 1st dragoons in June 1715, and on 6 July 1716 he was appointed a privy councillor. In the same year he became constable of Windsor Castle, and on 23 May 1718 was created Viscount Cobham. On 21 Sept. 1719 he sailed from Spithead in command of an expedition which was originally destined to

attack Coruña. Finding that place too strong, however, he attacked Vigo instead, captured the town, and destroyed the military stores accumulated there (*Addit. MS.* 15936, f. 270). On 10 April 1721 he was appointed colonel of the 'king's own' horse, in 1722 comptroller of the accounts of the army, and governor of Jersey for life in 1723 (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 11th Rep. iv. 138).

Until 1733 Cobham, with the rest of the whigs, supported Walpole's ministry. In that year he strongly opposed Walpole's scheme of excise (*ib.* 8th Rep. i. 18). This difference led to others, and, in consequence of a strongly worded protest against the protection of the South Sea Company's directors by the government, Lord Cobham and Charles Paulet, third duke of Bolton [q. v.], were dismissed from their regiments. In the case of an old and tried soldier like Lord Cobham this proceeding caused a great sensation. Bills were introduced in both houses to take from the crown the power of breaking officers, and motions were made to petition the king to inform them who had advised him to such a course. By breaking with Walpole Cobham forfeited the favour of the king; but by opposing the excise he gained the esteem of the Prince of Wales, and by assailing the South Sea Company he obtained the sympathy of the people. In association with Lyttelton and George Grenville, he formed an independent whig section known as the 'boy patriots,' which in 1735 was joined by William Pitt (*HERVEY, Memoirs*, i. 165, 215, 245, 250, 288, 291; *Coxe, Life of Walpole*, 1798, pp. 406, 409; *Gent. Mag.* 1734, *passim*).

On 27 Oct. 1735 Cobham attained the rank of general. During the rest of Walpole's ministry he maintained his attitude of opposition, and in 1737 joined in a protest against the refusal of the upper house to request the king to settle 100,000*l.* a year on the Prince of Wales out of the civil list (*HERVEY, Memoirs*, iii. 89-90). After Walpole's downfall a coalition was effected among Lord Wilmington, the Pelhams, and the prince's party, which Cobham joined. He was created a field-marshal on 28 March 1742, and on 25 Dec. was appointed colonel of the first troop of horse-guards. On 9 Dec. following, however, he resigned his commission, owing to the strong objections he conceived to employing British troops in support of Hanoverian interests on the continent (*Addit. MS.* 32701, f. 302).

In 1744, on the expulsion from the cabinet of John Carteret, lord Granville, the chief supporter of the continental policy, the greater part of the whig opposition effected

a coalition with the Pelhams, in which Lord Cobham joined on receiving a pledge from Newcastle that the interests of Hanover should be subordinated to those of England. On 5 Aug. he was appointed colonel of the 1st dragoons, which was exchanged in the following year for the 10th.

Cobham died on 13 Sept. 1749, and was buried at Stowe. He married Anne, daughter of Edmund Halsey of Stoke Pogis, Buckinghamshire, but had no issue. According to the terms of the grant he was succeeded in the viscounty and barony by his sister Hester, wife of Richard Grenville of Wootton, Buckinghamshire. He was succeeded in the baronetcy by his cousin, William Temple, great-grandson of Sir John Temple of Stantonbury, who was the second son of Sir Thomas Temple, the first baronet.

Cobham rebuilt the house at Stowe and laid out the famous gardens. He was a friend and patron of literary men, whom he frequently entertained there. Both Pope and Congreve celebrated him in verse—Pope in the first of his 'Moral Essays,' and Congreve in 'A Letter to Lord Cobham' written in 1729. Pope was a frequent visitor at Stowe, and Congreve was honoured by a funeral monument there distinguished by its singular ugliness (*SWIFT, Works*, ed. Scott, index; *POPE, Works*, ed. Elwin, index; *RUFFHEAD, Life of Pope*, 1769, p. 212; *Egerton MS.* 1949, ff. 1, 3).

Cobham was a member of the Kit-Cat Club, and his portrait was painted with those of the other members by Sir Godfrey Kneller [q. v.] It was engraved by Jean Simon, and in 1732 by John Faber the younger. Another portrait, painted by Jean Baptiste Van Loo, was purchased for the National Portrait Gallery in June 1869; it was engraved by George Bickham in 1751, and by Charles Knight in 1807 (*SMITH, British Mezzotint Portraits*, pp. 380, 1120; *BROMLEY, Cat. of British Portraits*, p. 257).

[*Prime's Account of the Temple Family*, New York, 3rd edit. 1896; *G. E. C. [okayne's] Peerage*, ii. 324-5; *Collins's Peerage of England*, ed. Brydges, ii. 414-15; *Whitmore's Account of the Temple Family*, 1856, p. 6; *Coxe's Memoirs of the Pelham Administration*, 1829, i. *passim*; *Edye's Records of the Royal Marines*, i. index; *Beatson's Political Index*, ii. 115; *Memoirs of the Kit-Cat Club*, 1821, pp. 118-19; *Glover's Memoirs*, 1814, *passim*; *Doyle's Official Baronage*, i. 419; *Mahon's Hist. of England*, 1839, i. 170, 511, ii. 256, 262-4; *Gent. Mag.* 1748, p. 23; *Gibbs's Worthies of Buckinghamshire*, p. 106; *Notes and Queries*, 3rd ser. ii. 391; *Brit. Museum Addit. MSS.* 5795 f. 371, 5938; *Egerton MS.* 2529, f. 86; *Stowe MSS.* 248 f. 24, 481 ff. 89-166.]

TEMPLE, SIR THOMAS (1614-1674), baronet of Nova Scotia, governor of Acadia, second son of Sir John Temple of Stanton Bury, Buckinghamshire, who was knighted by James I at Royston on 21 March 1612-13 (METCALFE, *Knights*, p. 164), by his first wife, Dorothy (*d.* 1625), daughter and co-heiress of Edmund Lee of Stanton Bury, was born at Stowe (his father's house being leased to Viscount Purbeck), and baptised there on 10 Jan. 1614. His grandfather was Sir Thomas Temple, first baronet of Stowe [see under **TEMPLE, SIR RICHARD**, 1634-1697]. On 20 Sept. 1656 Sir Charles St. Etienne made over to Thomas Temple and to William Crowne, father of the dramatist John Crowne [q.v.], all his interest in a grant of Nova Scotia, of which country the English had become masters in 1654. This grant was confirmed by Cromwell, who regarded the Temple family with favour, and the Protector further appointed 'Colonel Thomas Temple, esquire,' governor of Acadia. Temple set out for New England in 1657, occupied the forts of St. John and Pentagöet in Acadia or Nova Scotia, and resisted the rival claims of the French 'governor' Le Borgne. At the Restoration Temple's claims to retain the governorship were disputed, but on his return to England they were finally upheld. He was created a baronet of Nova Scotia by Charles II on 7 July 1662, and three days later received a fresh commission as governor. Five years afterwards by the treaty of Breda (July 1667) Charles II ceded Nova Scotia to Louis XIV, and in December 1667 Charles sent a despatch to Temple ordering him to cede the territory to the French governor Sr. Marillon du Bourg. The surrender was not completed until the fall of 1670. Temple was promised, but never received, a sum of 16,200*l.* as an indemnification for his loss of property. The ex-governor settled at Boston, Massachusetts, where he enjoyed a reputation for humanity and generosity. In 1672 he subscribed 100*l.* towards the endowment of Harvard College (QUINCY, *Hist. of Harvard*, 1840, vol. i. app.) He joined the church of Cotton Mather, but his morals were not quite rigid enough to please the puritans of New England. He moved to London shortly before his death on 27 March 1674. He was buried at Ealing, Middlesex, on 28 March (HUTCHINSON, *Massachusetts Collections*, p. 445). He left no issue.

[Notes supplied by Mr. J. A. Doyle; Whitmore's Account of the Temple Family, 1856, p. 5; Prime's Temple Family, New York, 1896, p. 42; Murdoch's Hist. of Nova Scotia, 1865, i. 134-9, 153; Maine Hist. Soc. Collections, i. 301; Williamson's Hist. of Maine, i. 363, 428; Mc-

moires des Commissaires du Roi et de ceux de sa Majesté Britannique, 1756 (containing the documents relating to the surrender of Acadia by Temple); Kirke's First English Conquest of Canada, 1871; Winsor's Hist. of America, iv. 145; Cal. State Papers, Amer. and West Indies, 1661-8, passim, esp. pp. 96, 597, 626.]

TEMPLE, SIR WILLIAM (1555-1627), fourth provost of Trinity College, Dublin, was a younger son of Anthony Temple. The latter was a younger son of Peter Temple of Derset and Marston Boteler, Warwickshire, whose elder son, John, founded the Temple family of Stowe (cf. LORER, *Peerage*, v. 233; *Herald and Genealogist*, 1st ser. iii. 398; LIPSCOMB, *Buckinghamshire*, iii. 85; and see art. **TEMPLE, SIR RICHARD**, 1634-1697). Sir William Temple's father is commonly identified with Anthony Temple (*d.* 1581) of Coughton, Warwickshire, whose wife was Jane Bargrave. But in this Anthony Temple's will, which was signed in December 1580 and has been printed in Prime's 'Temple Family' (p. 105), Peter was the only son mentioned; he was well under eighteen years of age, and was doubtless the eldest son. There may possibly have been an unmentioned younger son, William, but he could not have been more than fifteen in 1580. On the other hand, the known facts of our Sir William's career show that before that date he was a graduate of Cambridge and in that year made a reputation as a philosopher. Moreover he was stated to be in his seventy-third year at his death in 1627. The year of his birth cannot consequently be dated later than 1555, and when Anthony Temple of Coughton died in 1581, he must have been at least five-and-twenty.

William was educated at Eton, whence he passed with a scholarship to King's College, Cambridge, in 1573 (HARWOOD, *Alumni*). In 1576 he was elected a fellow of King's, and graduated B.A. in 1577-8 and M.A. in 1581. Though destined for the law, he became a tutor in logic at his college and an earnest student of philosophy. 'In his logic readings,' wrote a pupil, Anthony Wotton [q.v.], in his 'Runne from Rome' (1624), 'he always laboured to fit his pupils for the true use of that art rather than for vain and idle speculations.' He accepted with enthusiasm the logical methods and philosophical views of the French philosopher Pierre de la Ramée, known as Ramus (1515-1572), whose vehement attacks on the logical system of Aristotle had divided the learned men of Europe into two opposing camps of Ramists and Aristotelians. Temple rapidly became the most active champion of the

Ramists in England. In 1580 he replied in print to an impeachment of Ramus's position by Everard Digby (*N.* 1590) [q. v.] Adopting the pseudonym of Franciscus Mildapettus of Navarre (Ramus had studied in youth at the Parisian Collège de Navarre), he issued a tract entitled 'Francisci Mildapetti Navarreni ad Everardum Digbeium Anglum admonitio de unica P. Rami methodo reiectis cæteris retinenda,' London (by Henry Middleton for Thomas Mann), 1580. The work was dedicated to Philip Howard, first earl of Arundel, whose acquaintance Temple had made while the earl was studying at Cambridge. Digby replied with great heat next year, and Temple retorted with a volume published under his own name. This he again dedicated to the Earl of Arundel, whom he described as his Mæcenas, and he announced to him his identity with the pseudonymous 'Mildapettus.' Temple's second tract bore the title, 'Pro Mildapetti de unica Methodo Defensione contra Diplodophilum [i.e. Digby] commentatio Gulielmi Tempelli e regio Collegio Cantabrigiensi.' He appended to the volume an elaborate epistle addressed to another champion of Aristotle and opponent of Ramus, Johannes Piscator of Strasburg, professor at Herborn. Temple's contributions to the controversy attracted notice abroad, and this volume was reissued at Frankfort in 1584 (this reissue alone is in the British Museum). Meanwhile in 1582 Temple had concentrated his efforts on Piscator's writings, and he published in 1582 a second letter to Piscator with the latter's full reply. This volume was entitled 'Gulielmi Tempelli Philosophi Cantabrigiensis Epistola de Dialecticis P. Rami ad Joannem Piscatorem Argentinensem una cum Joannis Piscatoris ad illam epistolam responsione,' London (by Henry Middleton for John Harrison and George Bishop), 1582.

Meanwhile, on 11 July 1581, Temple had supplicated for incorporation as M.A. at Oxford (FOSTER, *Alumni Oxon.*), and soon afterwards he left Cambridge to take up the office of master of the Lincoln grammar school. In 1584 he made his most valuable contribution to the dispute between the Ramists and Aristotelians by publishing an annotated edition of Ramus's 'Dialectics.' It was published at Cambridge by Thomas Thomas, the university printer, and is said to have been the first book that issued from the university press (MULLINGER, *Hist. of Cambridge University*, ii. 405). The work bore the title, 'P. Rami Dialecticæ libri duo scholius G. Tempelli Cantabrigiensis illustrati.' A further reply to Piscator was

appended. The dedication was addressed by Temple from Lincoln under date 4 Feb. to Sir Philip Sidney. In the same year Temple contributed a long preface, in which he renewed with spirit the war on Aristotle, to the 'Disputatio de prima simplicium et concretorum corporum generatione,' by a fellow Ramist, James Martin [q. v.] of Dunkeld, professor of philosophy at Turin. This also came from Thomas's press at Cambridge; it was republished at Frankfort in 1589. In the same place there was issued in 1591 a severe criticism of both Martin's argument and Temple's preface by an Aristotelian, Andreas Libavius, in his 'Questionum Physicarum controversarum inter Peripateticos et Rameos Tractatus' (Frankfort, 1591).

Temple's philosophical writings attracted the attention of Sir Philip Sidney, to whom the edition of Ramus's 'Dialectics' was dedicated in 1584, and Sidney marked his appreciation by inviting Temple to become his secretary in November 1585, when he was appointed governor of Flushing. He was with Sidney during his fatal illness in the autumn of the following year, and his master died in his arms (17 Oct. 1586). Sidney left him by will an annuity of 30*l.* Temple's services were next sought successively by William Davison [q. v.], the queen's secretary, and Sir Thomas Smith [q. v.], clerk of the privy council (BIRCH, *Memoirs of Elizabeth*, ii. 106). But about 1594 he joined the household of Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex, and for many years performed secretarial duties for the earl in conjunction with Anthony Bacon [q. v.], Henry Cuff [q. v.], and Sir Henry Wotton [q. v.] In 1597 he was, by Essex's influence, returned to parliament as member for Tamworth in Staffordshire. He seems to have accompanied Essex to Ireland in 1599, and to have returned with him next year. When Essex was engaged in organising his rebellion in London in the winter of 1600-1, Temple was still in his service, together with one Edward Temple, whose relationship to William, if any, has not been determined. Edward Temple knew far more of Essex's treasonable design than William, who protested in a letter to Sir Robert Cecil, written after Essex's arrest, that he was kept in complete ignorance of the plot (*Brit. Mus. Addit. MS.* 4160, No. 78; SPEDDING, *Bacon*, ii. 364). No proceedings were taken against either of the Temples.

William Temple's fortunes were prejudiced by Essex's fall. Sir Robert Cecil is said to have viewed him with marked disfavour. Consequently, despairing of success in political affairs, Temple turned anew to literary study. In 1605 he brought out, with a dedi-

cation to Henry, prince of Wales, 'A Logically Analysis of Twentye Select Psalmes performed by W. Temple' (London, by Felix Kyngston for Thomas Man, 1605). He is apparently the person named Temple for whom Bacon vainly endeavoured, through Thomas Murray of the privy chamber, to procure the honour of knighthood in 1607-8 (SPEDDING, iv. 2-3). But soon afterwards his friends succeeded in securing for him a position of profit and dignity. On 14 Nov. 1609 he was made provost of Trinity College, Dublin. Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, the chancellor of the university, was induced to assent to the nomination at the urgent request of James Ussher [q. v.] Temple was thenceforth a familiar figure in the Irish capital. He was appointed a master in chancery at Dublin on 31 Jan. 1609-10, and he was returned to the Irish House of Commons as member for Dublin University in April 1613. He represented that constituency till his death.

Temple proved himself an efficient administrator of both college and university, attempting to bring them into conformity at all points with the educational system in vogue at Cambridge. Many of his innovations became permanent features of the academic organisation of Dublin. By careful manipulation of the revenues of the college he increased the number of fellows from four to sixteen, and the number of scholars from twenty-eight to seventy. The fellows he was the first to divide into two classes, making seven of them senior fellows, and nine of them junior. The general government of the institution he entrusted to the senior fellows. He instituted many other administrative offices, to each of which he allotted definite functions, and his scheme of college offices is still in the main unchanged. He drew up new statutes for both the college and the university, and endeavoured to obtain from James I a new charter, extending the privileges which Queen Elizabeth had granted in 1595. He was in London from May 1616 to May 1617 seeking to induce the government to accept his proposals, but his efforts failed. His tenure of the office of provost was not altogether free from controversy. He defied the order of Archbishop Abbot that he and his colleagues should wear surplices in chapel. He insisted that as a layman he was entitled to dispense with that formality. Privately he was often in pecuniary difficulties, from which he sought to extricate himself by alienating the college estates to his wife and other relatives (STUBBS, *Hist. of the University of Dublin*, 1889, pp. 27 sq.)

Temple was knighted by the lord-deputy, Sir Oliver St. John (afterwards Lord Grandison), on 4 May 1622, and died at Trinity College, Dublin, on 15 Jan. 1626-7, being buried in the old college chapel (since pulled down). At the date of his death negotiations were begun for his resignation owing to 'his age and weakness.' His will, dated 21 Dec. 1626, is preserved in the public record office at Dublin (printed in Temple Prime's 'Temple Family,' pp. 168-9). He was possessed of much land in Ireland. His wife Martha, daughter of Robert Harrison, of a Derbyshire family, was sole executrix. By her Temple left two sons—Sir John [q. v.], afterwards master of the rolls in Ireland, and Thomas—with three daughters, Catharine, Mary, and Martha. The second son, Thomas, fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, became rector of Old Ross, in the diocese of Ferns, on 6 March 1626-7. He subsequently achieved a reputation as a puritan preacher in London, where he exercised his ministry at Battersea from 1641 onwards. He preached before the Long parliament, and was a member of the Westminster assembly. He purchased for 450*l.* an estate of 750 acres in co. Westmeath, and, dying before 1671, was buried in the church of St. Lawrence, Reading. By his wife Anne, who was of a Reading family, he left two daughters (TEMPLE PRIME, pp. 24-5).

[Authorities cited; Cole's Manuscript History of King's College, Cambridge, ii. 157 (in Addit. MS. 5815); Lodge's Peerage, s.v. 'Temple, viscount Palmerston,' iii. 233-4; Temple Prime's Account of the Family of Temple, New York, 3rd edit. 1896, pp. 23 sq., 105 sq.; Mind (new ser.), vol. i.; Ware's Irish Writers; Parr's Life of Ussher, pp. 374 et seq.; Ebrington's Life and Works of Ussher, 1847, i. 32, xvi. 329, 335.] S. L.

TEMPLE, SIR WILLIAM (1628-1699), statesman and author, born at Blackfriars in London in 1628, was the grandson of Sir William Temple (1555-1627) [q. v.], provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and formerly secretary to Sir Philip Sidney. His father, Sir John Temple [q. v.], master of the rolls in Ireland, married, in 1627, Mary (*d.* 1638), daughter of John Hammond, M.D. [q. v.], and sister of Dr. Henry Hammond [q. v.], the divine. William was the eldest son. A sister Martha, who married, on 21 April 1662, Sir Thomas Giffard of Castle Jordan, co. Meath, was left a widow within a month of her wedding, and became a permanent and valued inmate of her eldest brother's household; she died on 31 Dec. 1722, aged 84, and was buried in the south aisle of Westminster Abbey on 5 Jan. 1723.

William Temple was brought up by his uncle, Dr. Henry Hammond, at the latter's rectory of Penshurst in Kent. When Hammond was sequestered from his living in 1643, Temple was sent to Bishop Stortford school, where he learnt all the Latin and Greek he ever knew; the Latin he retained, but he often regretted the loss of his Greek. On 13 Aug. 1644 he was entered as a fellow-commoner of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he remained a pupil of Ralph Cudworth for two years. Leaving Cambridge without taking any degree, in 1648 he set out for France. On his road he fell in with the son and daughter (Dorothy) of Sir Peter Osborne. Sir Peter held Guernsey for the king, and his family were ardent royalists. At an inn where they stopped in the Isle of Wight young Osborne amused himself by writing with a diamond on the window pane, 'And Hamon was hanged on the gallows they had prepared for Mordecai.' For this act of malignancy the party were arrested and brought before the governor; whereupon Dorothy, with ready wit and a singular confidence in the gallantry of a roundhead, took the offence upon herself, and was immediately set at liberty with her fellow-travellers. The incident made a deep impression upon Temple; he was only twenty at the time, and the lady twenty-one. A courtship was commenced, though the father of the hero was sitting in the Long parliament, while the father of the heroine was holding a command for the king. Even when the war ended and Sir Peter Osborne returned to his seat of Chicksands in Bedfordshire, the prospects of the lovers seemed scarcely less gloomy. Sir John Temple had a more advantageous alliance in view for his son. Dorothy, on her side, was besieged by many suitors. Prominent among them were Sir Justinian Isham [q. v.], her distant cousin Thomas Osborne (afterwards Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds) [q. v.], and Henry Cromwell [q. v.], the fourth son of the Protector, who made her the present of a fine Irish greyhound. Even more hostile to the match than Temple's father were Dorothy's brothers, one of whom, Henry, was vehement in his reproaches. At the close of seven years of courtship and correspondence, during which Temple was in Paris, Madrid, St. Malo, and Brussels (the city of his predilection), acquiring French and Spanish, Dorothy fell ill, and was cruelly pitted with the small-pox. Temple's constancy had now been proved enough, and on 31 Jan. 1654-5 the faithful pair were united before a justice of the peace in the parish of St. Giles's, Middlesex. At the close of 1655 they repaired to Ireland,

Temple spending the next few years alternately at his father's house in Dublin and upon his own small estate in Carlow. During his seclusion he read a good deal, acquired a taste for horticulture, and 'to please his wife' penned some indifferent verses and translations, which were afterwards included in his 'Works.' A more distinctive composition of this period was a family prayer which was adapted 'for the fanatic times when our servants were of so many different sects,' and was designed that 'all might join in it.'

Upon the Restoration Temple was chosen a member of the Irish convention for Carlow, and in May 1661 he was elected for the county in the Irish parliament. During a visit to England in July 1661 he was coldly introduced at court by Ormonde, but subsequently he entirely overcame Ormonde's prejudices. In May 1663, upon the prorogation of the Irish parliament, he removed to England, and settled at Sheen in a house which occupied the site of the old priory, in the neighbourhood of the Earl of Leicester's seat at Richmond (cf. CHANCELLOR, *Hist. of Richmond*, 1894, p. 73). His widowed sister, Lady Giffard, came to live with the Temples during the summer, their united income amounting to between 500*l.* and 600*l.* a year. At Sheen, Temple planted an orangery and cultivated wall-fruit 'the most exquisite nailed and trained, far better than ever I noted it' (EVELYN).

Ormonde provided him with letters to Clarendon and Arlington, and Temple apprised Arlington of his desire to obtain a diplomatic post, subject to the condition that it should not be in Sweden or Denmark. In June 1665 he was accordingly nominated to a diplomatic mission of no little difficulty to Christopher Bernard von Ghelen, prince-bishop of Munster. The Anglo-Dutch war was in progress, and the bishop had undertaken, in consideration of a fat subsidy, to create a diversion in favour of Great Britain by invading Holland from the east. Temple was to remit the money by instalments and to expedite the bishop's performance of his part of the contract (many interesting details of the mission are given in Temple's letters to his brother, to Arlington, and others, published by Swift from the copies made by the diplomatist's secretary, Thomas Downton). The bishop was more than a match for Temple in the subtleties of statecraft. He managed on various pretexts to postpone the raid into Holland (with the states of which he was nominally at peace) until he had secured several instalments of subsidy. In the meantime Louis XIV had got wind of the conspiracy and detached twenty thousand